THE

PRINCESS OF WALES

SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES

Edited by

GOPĪ NĀTHA KAVIRĀJA

VOL. V

GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY,
BENARES.

1926

(Price Rupees five for each volume).

THE
PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES

EDITED BY
GOPĪ NĀTHA KAVIRĀJA

Vol. V.

Printed by Rameshwar Pathak, at the Tara Printing Works, Benares and published under the authority of the Government of the United Provinces by the Superintendent of the Government Press, Allahabad.

GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY,
BENARES.

1926.

CONTENTS.

I—ANCIENT HOME OF THE ARYANS AND THEIR MIGRATION TO INDIA.

By Atul Chandra Ganguly.

During the latter half of the last century the philologists inferred from philological and geographical reasons derived from the traditions preserved in the Avesta that the first ancestors of the Indians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, and other European races speaking Aryan Languages were living together within the same enclosures, that the home of the Indo-Germanic race is to be sought in the Central Highlands of Asia, and that after their invasion of India some three or four thousand years before Christ, one section of the race passed to Persia and the others directly from their original home went to Europe, and lastly that the ancient language of the Aryan conquerors of India was the oldest branch of that primal stock which in other regions and ages developed distinctive perfections in the utterance of Plato, of Virgil, or of Shakespeare. The protest against the central Asian hypothesis was first raised by the modern geological, archaeological and anthropological investigators. The first among the causes which have led to this protest is the discovery that the present races of Europe speaking Aryan languages have been inhabiting it since the beginning of the neo-lithic period whose age, according to M. Morlot and others, may be from 8000 to 10,000 years. Their second objection is that those who now speak Aryan languages do not belong to one race, but to several. In the third place they hold that the most ancient records of any actual events which we possess are no longer the slabs with cuneiform writing disinterred from Babylonian mounds, but the immeasurably older memorials of successful hunts, preserved

in the caverns of the Dordogne, which were inscribed by the contemporaries of the mammoth on the bones and tusks of extinct animals, compared with which the records on Babylonian tablets, or in Egyptian tombs, much more the traditions preserved in the Avesta, are altogether modern. Last, they assert that in no part of Europe has it been proved that there was interruption of continuity between the ages of stone and metal, and there is no evidence whatever to show that the present inhabitants of Europe are not descended from the people of the neo-lithic age, whose civilisation was of a very rudimentary character; and these conclusions, they say, which are now generally accepted by archaeologists, are fatal to the old theory that the Aryans were a comparatively civilised people, who invaded Europe from the East bringing with them bronze weapons which enabled them to subdue the aboriginal inhabitants of Europe. These discoveries have at once been followed by the abandonment of the Asiatic hypothesis by many eminent scholars who now advocate the European hypothesis.

Now, although many eminent scholars are in general agreement regarding these points, the inferences which they have drawn from the results of their investigations are so very conflicting that Dr. Smith has been led to write, 'The question of the original seat of the Aryan stock, one branch of which entered India, has given rise to *many theories, which agree only in not being proved*' (p. 26, The Oxford Students' History of India, 8th Edit.). Thus Topinard, a distinguished follower of Broca, remarks that it has been proved that the anthropological types in Europe have been continuous, and if the Aryans came from Asia they can have brought with them nothing but their language, their civilisation, and a knowledge of metals. Their blood has disappeared. The objection to this hypothesis has been

brought by others on the ground that there is no archaeological evidence for any such intrusive race. According to them one of the four European types, which may be traced continuously in occupation of their present seats to the neo-lithic period, must represent the primitive Aryan stock. But the question can not be considered as determined, the French and German scholars being ranged in opposite camps. German scholars, notably Posche, Penka, Hehu, and Lindenschmit, have contended that the physical type of the primitive Aryans was that of the North Germans—a tall, fair, blue-eyed dolichocephalicrace. French writers, on the other hand, such as Chavee, De Mortillet, and Ujfalvy, have maintained that the primitive Aryans were brachycephalic, and that the true Aryan type is represented by the Gauls' (p. 226, Origin of the Aryans, Taylor). On the other hand, Prof. William Ripley, the author of 'The Races of Europe', observes, 'The European races, as a whole, show signs of a secondary or derived origin ; certain characteristics, especially the texture of the hair, lead us to class them as immediate between the extreme primary types of the Asiatic and the negro races respectively' (p. 457). He concludes that after the partial occupation of Western Europe by a dolichocephalic Africanoid type in the stone age, an invasion by a broad-headed race of decidedly Asiatic affinities took place. This intrusive element, he shows, is represented to-day by the Alpine type of Central Europe.

In a word, although the existence of an Aryan race in Europe in early Neo-lithic age is established, and, therefore, the theory of Aryan migrations from an Asiatic home in later post-Glacial times is untenable, it does not prove that the Aryan race is autochthonous in Europe and the question of its original home cannot therefore be regarded as finally settled. The results of the recent investigations by Prof. Arthur Keith that savagery has throughout been

co-existent with civilisation and that man has the human standard in size of brain by the commencement of the Pliocene period, have complicated the matter very much; and the problem has become all the more complex and difficult, because hitherto the investigations along this line have been carried on on the belief that savagery is civilisation in embryo and that a period of not more than some 80,000 years had elapsed since humanity was represented by a forest ape. When we know that even the higher humanity is at least 400,000 years old, and that the supposed identity of prehistory among savage races is as remote from the truth as the notion that the earth is flat, we can no longer accept primitive implements of savagery as proof positive of the state of civilisation at their supposed epoch; because the implements of 'primitive' culture are much more durable than any monument that civilised man is likely to leave behind him. Celts and arrow-heads may survive their markers for hundreds of thousands of years, but it would be difficult to name a single article of modern manufacture which could long withstand the vicissitudes of flood and fire. If then the earth was really inhabited, as for example during Pliocene Age, by beings of higher mentality than any extant savage, the mere absence of material relics would not warrant the inference that they were uncivilised. Even the archaeological investigations have shown the probability of the overlapping of the ages of bronze and stone. The tombs which contain bronze weapons of archaic forms not infrequently contain stone weapons as well (p. 128, Origin of the Aryans, Taylor).

Some scholars lay too much stress on the results derived from a study of the science of linguistic palaeontology. They have tried to show that the undivided Aryans were a neo-lithic people, in the pastoral rather than the agricultural stage, and were herdsmen rather than shepherds, simply because a large

number of words common to every branch of Aryan speech refer to the cow, the terms relating to agriculture, weapons, metals, and religion having, as a rule, a more limited range. How fruitless are such attempts, and how extremely shadowy are their arguments and conclusions will be evident from a careful study of the Ṛgveda which has been written by the Aryans immediately after their separation from the original stock recording the events which soon followed their separation, which, according to these scholars, is a production of a childlike brain. Now the fact which needs recognition is that every kind of evidence must be considered on its true merits; but instead of that we twist and distort it so as to fit it into a pre-ordained scheme. In order that we may discover the true history of so remote a period as the expansion of the Aryans, all the apparently conflicting evidences which are beyond the shadow of a doubt are to be collected and examined on their true merits, and co-ordinated and harmonised into one whole in the light of some authentic written record which will be able to explain all these conflicting evidences. Unless this is done, no conclusion can really be reliable and there will be room always for difference of opinion regarding many points.

"The study of ancient monuments," writes Dr. Das, the author of 'Ṛgvedic India', "undoubtedly furnishes more or less reliable data for the construction of ancient history; but ancient records, either on stones or papyrus, or hymns committed to memory and handed down from generation to generation without the loss of even a single syllable, if such really exist, would, without doubt, be a better and surer source of reliable history. The ancient Egyptians had their records in hieroglyphic writing, as found on the famous Rosetta stone, and on walls and monuments, and in papyrus scrolls, inscribed in the hieratic character, which was 'a much modified cursive form of hieroglyphic simplified in the interest

of rapid writing'. These records have furnished antiquarians with abundant materials for writing a correct history of ancient Egypt. In Babylonia and Assyria, the records were inscribed either on stones or clay bricks that were afterwards baked. These brick-tablets which once formed the library of the Assyrian King Asshurabanapal at Ninevah have been found in large numbers, and carefully assorted and interpreted by Assyriologists. They have furnished reliable materials for writing a succinct history of ancient Mesopotamia" (pp. 4-5). But the Egyptian records in hieroglyphic writing and the Babylonian brick-tablets may take us back for seven or eight thousand years at the outside, and will not, therefore, help us at all in examining, co-ordinating and harmonizing the conflicting results drawn from the evidences supplied by the sciences of Archaeology, Geology and Anthropology, compared with which these written records are altogether modern. For this purpose immeasurably older written memorials are needed, and such authentic (and immeasurably older) written records are as we shall show presently, supplied by the so-called hymns of the Vedas, especially the Ṛgveda.

'In India', as has been observed by Dr. Das, 'no records either on stones, clay-bricks, or papyrus, of the same age as the Egyptian and Mesopotamian records, have anywhere been discovered. But the most ancient record of the Indo-Aryan culture is to be found in the sacred Scripture, called the Ṛgveda Saṃhitā.........The hymns, however, were not committed to writing on papyrus, palm-leaves, or baked clay-bricks, but to human memory carefully cultivated for the purpose, and were handed down from generation to generation without the loss of even a single word or syllable. The ancient Indo-Aryans probably thought this to be the surer and better method of preserving them from perishing in a world where everything, either stone, brick or papyrus

perishes, excepting the human mind and soul. And herein probably lies the fundamental difference unfortunately overlooked by the European scholars, between the spirits of pure Aryan and pure Semitic or Turanian civilisation. This intuition on the part of the ancient Indo-Aryans, of the superiority of mind and spirit over matter very probably accounts for the absence of any material proofs of their antiquity, which can directly appeal to an ordinary observer or antiquarian. The proofs they have left are altogether of a different kind, which can only be correctly read by those who are endowed with a far greater amount of patience, diligence, perseverence, and capacity for taking pains than is required in deciphering a clay-tablet or a stone slab, and in fixing the age of a broken statue, or a stone monument. It is because these proofs do not appeal to the senses that they have not hitherto received that amount of attention which they eminently deserve.........Even those who, by dint of their wonderful diligence and perseverence were able to master it, could not always get at the real spirit underlying the hymns, probably through bias, prejudice and preconceived ideas, with which they started their study and enquiry. These have, in many instances, blinded them to the real import of passages which, read in the light of modern scientific knowledge in the domains of Geology, Archaeology and Ethnology, could have put them on the right track, and led them to the discovery of great historical truths' (pp. 5, 6, Ibid).

The perusal of the first few chapters only of the work of Dr. Das will show how immeasurably old are the memorials preserved by the Vedic Ṛṣis in their sacred verses known as the Ṛks in which have been preserved the records of an age when there was a different distribution of land and water. Subsequently we shall show that all the evidences point to a period of time, which must undoubtedly

be placed, geologically speaking, before the close of the Pleistocene era. We shall now confine ourselves to the task of examining what the Vedas, especially the Ṛgveda, have to say regarding the 'Ancient home' of the Aryans, and examine them and bring into their proper relations the apparently conflicting results arrived at by the archaeological, geological and anthropological investigators in the light of these records.

Now we cannot pass on to our task without noticing a recent work on Ṛgvedic India published by the Calcutta University, from which we have already quoted. The subject matter of the book is that the original cradle of the Aryans was the Punjab (*i.e.* Sapta Sindhava, as it used to be called in Ṛgvedic times), which included Kashmere on the north and Gandhara on the west. In Ṛgvedic times the southern boundary, according to the learned author, was the Rajputna sea and the eastern boundary the Eastern sea covering the Gangetic trough. The author has tried to show that 'the Aryans were autocht honous in the Punjab, or at any rate had been living in the country from time immemorial,' and that their immigration, therefore, from central Asia, Northern Europe, or the Arctic region, is very improbable. He has given further shock to the western scholars by requesting them to carry the development of human civilisation in India back to hundreds of millenniums. He has arrived at his result from his own novel interpretation of certain references in the Ṛgveda which, according to him, can only be understood in the light of the results of modern geological investigations. Although there is some definite suggestion that the southern part of the Rajputana desert was a very shallow sea in ancient times there is absolutely nothing in historical tradition to support the conditions conjectured by Dr. Abinash Chandra Das (map at p 90), and the whole of tradition negatives them.

The most precious legacy which Dr. Das has handed up to us is, however, the line of research he has adopted in his book, which, if properly worked out, will yield valuable historical truths. He has inaugurated the method of finding out historical truths from the Veda read in the light thrown by the results of modern geological investigations, although here he has received some valuable hints from Mr. Pavgee's works, 'Aryavartic Home' and 'Vedic Fathers of Geology.' He has even adopted some of the interpretations of the Vedic hymns offered by Mr. Pavgee.

We shall now see how Dr. Das has summed up his arguments from internal references in the Ṛgveda, and then examine them critically to see how far these go to prove that the Aryans were autochthonous in the Punjab, the oldest life producing region in India, and that they did not settle there as colonists from any other country. The author has summed up his arguments thus : (1) There were four seas round about Sapta-Sindu, a fact which is confirmed by geological evidences; (2) the region was peopled by the Aryans from time immemorial, and they came to regard it as their original home ;——none of the Sanskrit books contain any reference to the foreign origin of the Aryans; (3) the region between the Indus and Sarasvatī was regarded as the god-fashioned land, the land in which the Aryans were born again and again, and it is significant as pointing to the belief of the ancient Aryans that they were autochthonous in Sapta-Sindhu ; (4) the region of Ilâ, which was as old as that of the Sarasvatī, was situated high up in the Himālaya, probably in Kashmere, and was the country where Dakṣa Prajâpati and Manu lived; (5) 'Indra was one of the oldest gods of the Aryans, to whom were ascribed the volcanic actions resulting in the tossing up of mountains, the depression of high lands and carving out of paths for the Indus in other rivers, which carry us back to the beginning of

human life on this globe'; (6) it was in Sapta-Sindhu that the first great exploits of Indra, *viz.*, the killing of Vṛtra, was performed; (7) 'the total absence of the mention of deluge in the Ṛgveda proves the period of the composition of the hymns to be anterior to that event'; (8) the soma sacrifice was the oldest sacrifice among the Aryans, and the genuine Soma plant grew nowhere else excepting the Himalayas; and (9) fire was first kindled in the region of the Sarasvatī. 'All these evidences', says the author, 'unmistakably point to the vast antiquity of the Ṛgveda and of Sapta-Sindhu, and go to prove that the Aryans were autochthonous in the Punjab.'

Although there were in ancient Ṛgvedic times, four seas, as we shall show later on, round about the region known to the ancient Aryans as Āryāvarta, he has not produced sufficient evidences to prove conclusively that there were four seas round about the region of Sapta-Sindhu. The mere mention of four seas in Ṛks, IX. 33.6, and X. 47.2 does not establish his theory that the four seas mentioned in the Ṛgveda were respectively the large Asiatic Mediterranian sea extending from the province of Balkh to the heart of Siberia and from the confines of Mongolia to the Black sea, on the north, the Eastern sea covering the Gangetic trough on the east, the Rajputana sea on the South and the Arabian sea on the west Moreover the existence of the four seas round about the region in which the Aryans lived does not prove that the Aryans were autochthonous in the country, and that they did not settle there as colonists from any other land; it can only point to the period of time when those Aryans lived in that region.

While examining his next point of argument we shall try to establish our theory that the Indo-Aryans were colonists from a country the mention of whose name has distinctly been made in the Ṛgveda and that it contains

distinct reminiscences of the life of the Aryans in that country. His next point of argument is that none of the old Sanskrit books contain any definite reference or allusion to the foreign origin of the ancient Indo-Aryans ; because, the author argues, the region had been inhabited by them from time imemorial and they came to regard Sapta-Sindhu as their original cradle. Here Dr. Das, to support his view, has cited the authority of the eminent Sanskrit scholar Muir, as if Muir cannot err. This statement of Dr. Das and others goes direct against everything of which we find mention in our oldest books. This he has supported by the argument that as the Aryans regarded Brahmāvarta as the Deva-created land, the land in which the Aryans were born again and again, it is significant as pointing to the belief of the ancient Aryans that they were not colonists from any other country. There is definite mention of the Ancient Home or dwelling place of the Aryans in the Ṛgveda. Thus in Ṛk, I. 30. 9, we find mention of 'pratnasya okasaḥ', which undoubtedly means 'Ancient Home' ('purātanasya nivāsasthānasya', Sāyana and Ramānātha). Sāyana has also pointed, following no doubt the footsteps of the traditional school, that this 'pratnasya okasaḥ' refers to 'Svarga', the Home of the Devas. "Anu pratnasya okasya huve tuvi pratim naram, yam te pûrvam pitâ huve": Translated this would mean, "My father sang before in praise of you who are the protector and lord of tht 'Ancient Home', now I also do the same". This 'Ancient Home' was the abode of the Devas and the original abode of the composer of the Ṛgvedic hymns. Hence it follows that Svarga (Dyau or Ilâ) is our original abode. This statement is supported by the Ṛk, I. 164, 33, in which definite mention has been made that 'Dyau is our fatherland (pitâ), our birth-place (janitâ) and our original birthplace (nâbhi=utpattisthânam, Sayana. Vide his comments on Ṛk, X, 10. 4.)'.

II. A SATRAP COIN

BY SHYAM LAL MEHR.

INTRODUCTION.

The coin was found in a small village in the Vijapur Taluka of the Baroda State. The find place is quite near Ahmadabad.

The coin no doubt belongs to some one of the Kṣatrapa rulers of Malwa—Kathiawar, as the bust of the prince on the obverse with the date, though rubbed out, and a Stupa-like emblem with a wavy line below and the crescent at the top on the reverse, clearly point out. The face, head-dress, and the long hair of the King resemble those found on the Kṣatrapa coins found and identified before.

The front portion of the King's bust appears to have been broken, and the legend on the obverse and a portion of it on the reverse have been rubbed out of existence on account of its brisk circulation.

PALAEOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

The Script of the legend is Brāhmī, and most of the letters on the reverse can be read with ease. They are :—

"(क्ष) (त्र) प स रु द्र स (ह) पु त्र स रा ज्ञो (म) (हा) (क्ष) (त्र)"

Now, excepting seven letters, the rest are clear. The first two and the last four have been guessed from what has been spared to us of the original letters from the ravages of time. The lower portion of the letters affords us the greatest help in surmising what particular letters there were in those places. But there is some difficulty in deciphering the third and the fourth letters from the last. Any casual observer may hurriedly combine them with the lower curve

of the following (त्त), and jump to the conclusion that there are no such letters as (म) (हा), but it is only one word, viz., (त्त). But when the letters are carefully examined, it would appear that all those three letters are disjoined. Between the lower point on the right side of the fourth letter, and the remaining curves of (हा) and (त्त) there is some space which clearly indicates that they are all separate letters. Thus it can be safely assumed that the last four letters are (म) (हा) (त्त) (त्र). But there is one letter left which requires some attention. It is the eighth letter from the beginning, viz., (ह). At the first sight this appears to be न, and people can hastily conclude that the coin belongs to the 'son of Rudrasena'. But on a critical examination of the letter, it becomes evident that the curve at the end of the letter is on the right side, like ह, and is not rounded on the left side which is usually found in the न of those times. (Cf. 'The Palaeography of India' by R. B. Gaurishanker Ojha, plate X). By comparing even the same letter, i. e., (ह), with those found in the inscriptions of various Kṣatrapa kings, both earlier and later, it becomes quite clear that a slight curve on the right side was an essential feature of ह, and that on the left side a sure accompaniment of न (e. g. in Rudradāma's Girnar Inscription shapes of न and ह and in later Kṣatrapas also). Even by comparing this letter with न found in the names of various princes bearing the designation of Rudrasena, we find that it does not resemble them, and hence we are naturally forced to read it as ह. Thus it is clear that the coin belongs not to the 'son of Rudrasena', but to that of Rudrasinha.

Coming to the general nature of the letters, we find that they do not possess any of the characteristics of those found on the coins of the earlier Kṣatrapas. That archaic tendency of letters is missing too. The figure of the Chaitya

which was made of round curves in the earlier coins does not appear in the coin under discussion. In it the Chaitya has been represented merely as a triangle and the moon by a very small line. This too points out that the coin belongs to some later Kṣatrapa.

The letters are proportionate, clear and well-embossed.

Identification.

Now, it remains to be determined as to which prince this coin belongs. There were three famous Kṣatrapa kings, each of whom had some Rudrasiṃha for his father—

(1) Rudra Sena I, son of Rudra Siṃha I-
A. D. 199—222.

(2) Dama Sena, son of Rudra Siṃha I-
A. D. 223—236.

(3) Yaśodaman II, son of Rudra Siṃha II
A. D. 317—332.

(1) Let us compare the coins of Rudra Sena I (Rapson's Catalogue, plate XII) with the coin under discussion. The characters of Rudra Sena's coins, though Brāhmī in script, are more archaic. The crescent and the chaitya are more regularly circular. Moreover the face of Rudra Sena does not resemble that of the prince of our coin.

(2) Dama Sena's coin also does not resemble the present coin, and the reasons are mostly the same as mentioned above.

(3) The coins of Yaśodaman II betray many similarities. The letters resemble, the stamping devices correspond, and even the two faces betray similar facial characteristics; and I first had come to the conclusion that the present coin belonged to Rudra Siṃha II's son, Yaśodaman II. But later on I found that I was mistaken, and the error had resulted from my incorrect reading of the last four letters. When

after careful consideration I discovered my mistake and came to believe in the present reading, I found it difficult to attribute this coin to Yaśodaman II, who was never a Mahākṣatrapa, while the present coin was issued by a prince who appears to have been a Mahākṣatrapa.

Who was this king, who resembled Yaśodaman so much and whose coin also resembled those of Yaśodaman ? The only difference between them was that the former appears to have been styled Mahākṣatrapa, while the latter was designated merely as Kṣatrapa. We hear of one prince, named Svāmi Rudradaman II, who came immediately after Yaśodaman II, and was the first Mahākṣatrapa since the time of Bhartṛdaman. " His reign ", according to Rapson, "must fall somewhere in the period between the years 327 A. D. and 358 A. D." Unluckily no coin or inscription belonging to this prince has been brought to light, with which the present coin can be compared. But the fact that Svāmī Rudradaman II came soon after Yaśodaman II comes to our help in establishing the identity of the prince of the coin under consideration.

A coin which greatly resembles those of Yaśodaman II must be of a prince, who might have flourished about his time, and there is no harm if a conjecture be hazarded that Svāmī Rudradaman II was the prince who issued this coin, and if this conjecture is believed, the difficulty about his parentage is removed, and a fresh light is thrown on his domestic relations, revealing him to be a son of Rudra Siṃha II and a brother of Yaśodaman II

SVĀMI RUDRA DAMAN.

After the troublous times were over and Kṣatrapas Rudra Siṁha II and Yaśodaman II restored peace and order in their kingdom Svāmī Rudradaman, presumably a son

of Rudra Siṃha II came to the throne and augmented the limits of his territories and assumed the title of Mahākṣatrapa.

Svāmī-Rudradaman II appears to have possessed long hair, big ear-lobes and prominent moustaches. His eyes were bright, his forehead projecting and his nose not unfairly small. From his face he appears to be stout, with a character easily swayed by emotions. Though no vigorousness shines out from his face, yet it reflects some of the sterling qualities of his race—humorous disposition, bravery, and good nature.

General Remarks.

There is a general belief that soon after Mahākṣatrapa Bhartṛdaman, the Satraps had to face some foreign invasion, and in some of their remote provinces and chiefly Gujerat, their authority was weakened. But no convincing evidences are produced for this theory. Only because two of the princes of the new family did not use the title of Mahākṣatrapa, Rapson and others have thrown out the conjecture that they were attacked by foreign invaders and that their authority was not recognised in distant provinces. Troubles there might have been at that time, for it is very natural that when one family supplants another, it is not usually by persuasion, but by the force of arms. The two Satraps of the new line, viz., Rudrasiṃha II and Yaśodaman II were engrossed in the consolidation of their power, and as a strong opposition was offered to them, they did not feel themselves confident to assume the supreme title of Mahākṣatrapa and were content to be called mere Kṣatrapas. After them, when Svāmī Rudradaman II took the reins of government in his hands, the opposition was crushed and the position of the new family became secure, and Svāmī Rudradaman took the title of Mahākṣatrapa. Thus we find that the idea of a struggle between two sections of the

same family, followed by the necessary commotion in the country, is more probable, and quite in accordance with numismatic evidences

III. AN ESTIMATE OF THE CIVILISATION OF THE VĀNARAS AS DEPICTED IN THE RĀMĀYANA.

By Manmatha Nath Roy.

Introductory Note.

The following paper from the pen of Mr. Manmatha Nath Roy, M.A , is an interesting contribution on the study of an aspect of the cultural history of ancient India. The paper is based on the Rāmayaṇa and deals with the civilisation of Vānaras, whom the writer identifies against the views of many with the Vrātya Āryas rather than Draviḍas or aborigines. His second paper, to be published in the following pages shortly, is a similar attempt based on similar data to treat the history of the Rakṣasas. It is needless to add that no study of ancient Indian culture can claim to be complete unless it takes note of the different elements of Indian People. The writer has been laboriously working as a Research Scholar for over two years in the Research Library, attached to the Govt. Sanskrit College, Sarasvati Bhavana, Benares. He has prepared a complete descriptive Index, almost cyclopaedic in its range and thoroughness, with a synoptic analysis of the contents, of the Rāmāyaṇa, arranging all the information available in the book under certain leading words. He has been doing the same work with all the Mahāpuraṇas and Upapurāṇas. It is an arduous task, taxing the patience and energy of a diligent worker, but when completed, as I hope it will be within a couple of years more, it

will mark a brilliant achievement in the field of Indian Scholarship. I can only hope that the work will be carried through. The paper on the "Vānaras" just published is a specimen of the Rāmāyanic Studies.

Sanskrit College, G. N. Kaviraj.
Benares.

* * * *

The word civilisation is a relative term, and as such it does not stand by itself. On the other hand it is closely connected with many things that vitally affect the well-being of a certain people. Again, it is never static in sense; it does not denote a *status quo*; it never signifies complete and absolute rest. On the other hand, it is dynamic by nature; it is replete with the thrill of life; it connotes continuous motion of a certain people from one stage to another in a vain struggle to reach the ideal, the outlines of which, though vague and hazy ultimately seek to elevate the individual self through the well-being of all the members.

And it is this goal towards which each and every society, however crude moves slowly; and it is the consciousness of this goal, however dim it may be and however vague its ultimate realisation, that together with the reminiscences of a brilliant past, give an external binding to the members of that society, which goes by the name of social organisation. In a savage society nobody respects the rights of his neighbour. There might is right. But as it advances through the process of evolution, the idea slowly dawns in the mind of some its members who try to communicate it to the slowly understanding, dumb masses. These men are known to history as the pioneers of civilisation. Thus civilisation may be defined as the process by which each and every member of a particular society tries to elevate his individual self with the active help and co-operation of his neighbours. Then, as it advances, it comes to include the whole humanity, for the term is never static in sense.

If it is so, then why should the subject matter of the present paper make men laugh in their sleeves ? For were not the Vānaras of the Rāmāyaṇa as good breathing and feeling beings as we are ? Had they not a glorious past to boast of ? Had they not a peculiar social organisation of their own, and a peculiar culture which was all their own ? It is just possible that their civilisation may be found wanting in certain respects when compared to those of the Āryas of the Madhya-Deśa and the Rākṣasas of Laṅkā, yet there could be no denial of the fact that it was a civilisation—grand in its simplicity !

At the outset it must be told that Vālmīki, the reputed author of the Rāmāyaṇa, tried to present these Vānaras as semi-divine beings, who had graced this vile earth with the sole object of helping Rāma to bring about the destruction of Rāvaṇa and his despicable accomplices who had for a very long time been terrorising over the innocent Ṛṣis and *Munis*, who acted as the standard-bearers of the civilisation of the Aryans in the distant and till then unexplored regions of Dakṣiṇāpatha. We are told that "when Viṣṇu had taken his birth as a son of Daśaratha, Brahman asked the assembled Devas to produce Vānara children on the leading and reputed Apsarās, Gandharvās, Yakṣa and Nāga girls, she-bears (ऋच), Vidyādharīs and Kinnarīs, and on the foremost of the Vānara ladies, so that they might give adequate help to this well-wisher Viṣṇu." In this connection these Vānaras are said to have been "strong, assuming forms at will, proficient in performing miracles, brave, swift like Viṣṇu, indestructible, resourceful, possessing divine forms and knowing the use of all weapons like the nectar-consuming gods." (1. 17. 1—6)*

* Unless otherwise mentioned, the references are to the Rāmāyaṇa (Bombay Edition).

Then we are told how Brahman produced Jāmbavāna, the chief of the bears, from a yawn, and how in accordance with the expressed desire of Brahman, the Devas, the high-souled Ṛṣis, the Siddhas, the Vidyādharas, the Nāgas and the Cāraṇas—all proceeded to produce Vānara children. Of these we are told that Indra produced Vālin, Sūrya produced Sugriva, Vṛhaspati Tārā, Kuvera Gandhamādana, Viśvakarma Nala, Agni Nīla, the Aśvin twins Mainda and Dvida, Varuṇa produced Suṣeṇa, Paryanya Śarava, Maruta Hanumān, and so on (1. 17. 7—17.)

Further on we are told "that on this occasion full one Kror of Vānaras were produced by various agencies;—Vānaras, who could assume forms and increase their strength at will and could move about without any restriction, approaching lions and tigers in the fields of strength and pride; well-versed in the use of all arms, who fought with huge stones and hillocks tooth and nail, powerful enough to displace mountains, uproot steady trees, produce agitation in the bosom of the ocean, tear open the earth with their feet, swim across the seas, soar through the sky, hold (the flow of) water, capture the elephant roaming freely in the forests and bring down the winged beings by their cries" (1. 17. 24—29).

Enough has been said above in support of the fact that what Vālmīki really intended was to present these Vānaras as semi-divine beings. But underneath this seeming finery and frippery there flashes forth, here and there, the crude flesh of the frail earthly being. And it may not be out of place to mention here that the aim of the present paper is to deal exactly with the kind of life led by the Vanaras of the Rāmāyaṇic Age. We are not out to-day to study the physiognomy of these much—condemned creatures, nor will we try to give an accurate measurement of the length of their tails.

Though not belonging directly to the field of our present enquiry, I introduce the present topic simply because it would furnish an interesting reading. Again it is only common sense that prompts me to describe what our heroes exactly looked like, before proceeding to describe how they lived. In so doing I shall play the painter who with a few careless strokes of his brush produces a finished picture.

What they looked like.

We are repeatedly told that the Vānaras were कामरूपिणः (1. 17. 18.; IV. 19. 10), that is, they could assume various forms at will ; सुदंष्ट्राः सम्पन्नबलशालिनः (IV. 26. 4.), having well-set teeth and mighty ; रोमहर्षणाः गिरिकुञ्जरमेघाभाः (IV. 31. 2. 3) looking like elephants as big as mountains and clouds, they made the hair stand on the end. In another connection we are told—

नखदंष्ट्रायुधाः सर्वे वीरा विकृतदर्शनाः ।
सर्वे शार्दूलदंष्ट्राश्च सर्वे विकृतदर्शनाः ॥
दशनागबलाः केचित्केचिद्दशगुणोत्तराः ।
केचिन्नागसहस्रस्य बभूवुस्तुल्यवर्चसः ॥

(IV. 31. 24—25)

The heroes having teeth and nails for their weapons presented a hideous appearance. All were furnished with teeth (sharp) like those of the tiger, hence terrific—looking. Some were in possession of the strength of ten elephants, some equalled a hundred elephants, while others were more than a match for a thousand !

Again in connection with the description of Sugrīva's palace, we are told that it abounded with

देवगन्धर्वपुत्रैश्च वानरैः कामरूपिभिः ।
दिव्यमालाम्बरधरैः शोभितां प्रियदर्शनैः ॥

(IV. 33. 6.)

noble looking Vānaras, all descended from the loins of Devas and Gandharvas, who could assume various forms at will, wearing unfading garlands and clothes. Then in connection with the general mobilisation of the Vânaras at the command of Sugrîva, we are informed that

> ततो नरेन्द्रसंकाशैस्तीक्ष्णदंष्ट्रैर्महाबलैः ।
> कृत्स्ना संछादिता भूमिरसंख्येयैः प्लवङ्गमैः ॥

(IV. 39. 10.)

the whole surface of the earth was covered with numerous powerful and princely Vânaras furnished with sharp teeth.

Again, in connection with the same we are told that the mobilisation order issued by Sugrīva was conveyed by Vânaras पतन्निज्योतिरध्वगाः, who could soar through the ærial regions (IV. 37. 17). Then, of the Vânaras who mustered strong at the desire of Sugrîva in Kiṣkindhâ we are told that these were

> त इमे बहुविक्रान्तैर्बलिभिर्भीमविक्रमैः ।
> आगता वानरा घोरा दैत्यदानवसंनिभाः ॥
> ख्यातकर्मापदानाश्च बलवन्तो जितक्लमाः ।
> पराक्रमेषु विख्याता व्यवसायेषु चोत्तमाः ॥
> पृथिव्यम्बुचराः.............................. ॥

(IV. 40. 3—5).

strong, vigorous and daring like the devil himself; powerful, untiring, valiant and patient; that they had achieved numerous successes and could move about in water and on the dry land! Then, on the eve of the battle, while Sâraṇa was introducing various Vânara chiefs to Râvaṇa, he used a very significant word. In connection with the description he gave about the Vânara chief Sannâdana, he said that

> यस्मात्तु परमं रूपं चतुष्पात्सु न विद्यते ।
> अतः संनादनो नाम वानराणां पितामहः ॥

(VI. 27. 18.)

there stood Sannâdana, the Nestor of the Vânaras, who excelled all other quadrupeds in personal beauty. In so saying he clearly included the Vânaras in the class of beings known as the four-footed ones.

In another connection these Vânaras have been described as ताम्रवदनाः हेमाभाः copper-faced and gold-coloured. (VI 42--14)

Lastly, more than once we are assured by the poet that these Vānaras had that delicate appendage attached to their body, which goes by the name of 'tail'. We are told for instance

सर्वे विकृतलांगूलाः सर्वे दंष्ट्रानखायुधाः ।
सर्वे विकृतचित्राङ्गाः सर्वे च विकृताननाः ॥

(VI. 41. 46)

Before the opening of the battle all the multi-coloured Vānaras stood ready for the contest with wry faces and ugly tails, having teeth and nails for their weapon.

Then the episode of setting fire to Hanumān's tail by the Rākṣasas is so well-known that it hardly needs any repetition (V. 53).

In that connection says Rāvaṇa

कपीनां किल लाङ्गूलमिष्टं भवति भूषणम् ।

The tail is the highly-prized and favourite appendage of the Vānaras. In another connection we are told that

नीरुजौ राघवौ दृष्ट्वा ततो वानरयूथपाः ।
सिंहनादं तदा नेदुर्लांगूलं दुधुवुश्च ते ॥

on finding the Rāghava brothers completely restored to health (by favour of Gaḍura), the Vānara chieftains expressed their joy by roaring aloud and shaking their tails !

At this place a word or two about this nature may not be wide of the mark. The outstanding characteristic in

4

their nature seems to have been चापल्यम् or flightiness. Rāma accuses Vālin of this drawback in his character (IX. 18. 5). Hanumān himself testifies to this weakness in the character of the Vānaras, when he speaks to the despondent Aṅgada in this strain—

नित्यमस्थिरचित्ता हि कपयो हरिपुङ्गव ।
नाज्ञाप्यं विसहिष्यन्ति पुत्रदारं विना त्वया ॥
(VI. 54. 9)

O chief of the Vānaras, your kinsmen are naturally fickle-minded and when separated from their wives and children they may not tolerate with your commands. Elsewhere Rāvaṇa's spy, Śuka, describes them as

प्रकृत्या कोपनास्तीक्ष्णा वानरा राक्षसाधिप ।

wrathful and rough by nature. Again Rāvaṇa pays the the following compliments in the course of his conversation with Prahasta,

चपला ह्यविनीताश्च चलचित्ताश्च वानराः ।
(VI. 57. 9)

the Vānaras are by nature, volatile, fickle-minded and unmethodical. But for this drawback in their nature, the Vānaras have been praised for wishing well of their masters (गुरुहिते स्थिताः), obedient (निदेशवर्तिनः IV. 40. 6), daring and persevering (पराक्रमेषु व्याख्याता व्यवसायेषु चोत्तमाः , IV-40-4), swift (महाजवाः, IV-37-10), irresistible (दुष्प्रसहाः), and powerful like the gods in the battle-field (युद्धे देवपराक्रमाः , VI. 28. 3).

Before closing this topic I should like to dilate a little on the size of the Vānaras. The poet, it must be noted, is silent on this point. Occasionally he uses such epithets as मत्तानिव महाद्विपान् न्यग्रोधानिव गांगेयान्, सालान् हैमवतानिव (VI. 28. 2), like mad elephants, like the banyan trees of the Gangetic regions and the Sāl trees growing on the Himalayas,

महाशैलनिकाशकाया: (VI.27.48), huge like the mountains; उन्मत्त-मातङ्गसन्निभा: (VI. 27. 41), like mad elephants; महापर्वतसंकाशा महाजीमूतनिस्वना : (VI. 27. 42), like huge mountains, roaring aloud like the rumbling clouds, to indicate the size of these Vānaras. But, I am afraid, the poet in his admiration for these creatures, has lost all sense of proportion here. He hardly states the fact. But light hails from other quarters. The Vāyu Purāṇa lays down the standard height of almost all creatures and there we find the undermentioned couplet :

अंगुलानां सहस्रन्तु चत्वारिंशांगुलं विना ।
पञ्चाशतं हयानाञ्च उत्सेधः शाखिनां स्मृतः ॥
(Vāyu 59. 12)

The standard height of the horse should be a thousand finger-breadths less forty, and that of the Vānaras fifty finger-breadths.

But I am inclined to think it was neither the one nor the other. The one is highly inflated, while the other seeks to depreciate the Vānaras of the Tretā Age. Therefore in accordance with the view expressed in the same Purāṇa that "every created being changes its size at the end of each cycle "(Vāyu- 59-10, called युगावस्था by the Viṣṇu Purāṇa II. 1. 27) I hazard this opinion that the truth lay somewhere between the two extremes, and that the Vānaras of the Tretā Age were certainly over 50 finger-breadths in height, though smaller in size than the elephants and the hills !

Number and habitats—It is sheer waste of energy to ransack the Rāmāyaṇa for discussing the exact number of the Vānara contemporaries of Rāma, for before composing his immortal poem, Vālmīki never cared to take a census of these creatures. Yet by gathering together the pieces of information scattered throughout the book, one is just able

to form a rough estimate about the Vānara-population of India in the Tretā Age. Alongside with this we shall also tell our readers where they came from.

When Lakṣmaṇa on the expiry of the rainy season wrathfully approached Sugrīva to call for an explanation for his dilatoriness in giving aid to Rāma as had been promised, Tārā hastened to placate him with the following words :—

कृता सुसंस्था सौमित्रे सुग्रीवेण पुरा यथा ।
अद्य तैः वानरैः सर्वैरागन्तव्यं महाबलैः ॥
ऋक्षकोटिसहस्राणि गोलांगूलशतानि च ।
अद्य त्वामुपयास्यन्ति जहि कोपमरिन्दम ॥
कोट्योऽनेकास्तु काकुत्स्थ कपीनां दीप्ततेजसाम् ॥
(IV. 35. 21-22)

As had been arranged previously by Sugrīva, the Vānaras were due that day. 1000 Koṭis of Ṛkṣas (bears), 100 Koṭis of Golāṅgūla Vānaras, in addition to many koṭis of illustrious Vānaras were expected to arrive that day.

When the general mobilisation order issued by Sugrīva reached the ears of the Vānaras, the number that responded to that call, was as follows: "3 Krors from the Añjana Hills; 10 krors from the Aṣṭāchala regions; 1000 krors from the Kailāsa hills, 1000,000 (one Padma) from Himālayan regions; 100 krors from the Vindhyā hills; Vānaras without number came from the Kṣīroda Sea; many more came from various forests, caves and rivers" (IV. 37-20-26). The total in this case comes roughly to 1 million, 2 thousand and 13.

When the armies under various Vānara chiefs actually arrived at Kiṣkindhā the muster-roll was as follows :

"Śata-Vali supplied 1 kror and 10 thousand; Tārā's father many krors and thousands, Rumā's father 1000 krors,

Kesarī many thousands; Gavākṣa 1000 krors; Dhūmra 2000 krors; Panasa 3 krors; Nīla 10 krors; Gavaya 5 krors; Darīmukha 1000 krors; Mainda and Dvivida thousands of krors: Gaya 3 krors, Jāmbavān 10 krors; Rumaṇvān 100 krors; Gandha Madana hundreds of thousands of krors; Aṅgada 1000 Padmas and 100 Śaṅkhas; Tārā 5 krors; Hanumān 1000 krors; Nala 100 krors and hundreds of thousands; Darīmukha 10 krors; in addition to the huge armies brought by Śarava, Kumuda, Vahni, Rambha and others" (IV. 39. 12-37). Expressed in terms of the English system of notation, the figures would come to billions and trillions. It would be interesting to compare the huge figure given above with the estimate of the Vanara army as given to Rāvaṇa by Sāraṇa: "Nīla surrounded by hundreds of thousands of Vānara chiefs; Aṅgada at the head of a huge army; Nala surrounded by another big army; a huge army consisting of the Vānaras of the Sandal forests led by Saṃrochana; a big army under Kumuda; Rambha with an army composed of the Vānaras residing on the Vindhya, the Kṛṣṇa and the Sahya hills; Śarava from the Sālveya hills at the head of an army composed of 30 krors: Vihāra army consisting of 41 lacs from the Pāriyātra hills; under Panasa an army of 50 lacs; another army of 60 lacs under Vinata, 70 lacs under Gavaya" (VI. 26. 11-46). Alongside with this should be read the following which is only in continuation of the above extract; "Krathana stands there surrounded by an army of 1000 krores of Vānaras; 1000 lacs with Pramāthī Gavākṣa, with the Golāṅgūla army of 100,00,000 Vānaras; Gaja, Gavākṣa, Gavaya, Nala and Nīla each attended by 10 krors (VI. 27. 23-47). Then if we care to compare Sāraṇa's estimate with the one given by Śuka to Rāvaṇa, the number is simply bewildering! For says he

एषां कोटिसहस्राणि नव पञ्च च सप्त च ।
तथा शंकुसहस्राणि तथा वृन्दशतानि च ॥
एते सुग्रीवसचिवाः किष्किन्धानिलयाः सदा ।
हरयो देवगन्धर्वैरुत्पन्नाः कामरूपिणः ॥

(VI. 28. 4-5)

These Vānaras, numbering 100 Vṛndas, 1000 Śaṅkus and 21000 krors, born of the Devas and the Gandharvas and assuming various forms at will, are the immediate companions of Sugrīva hailing from Kiṣkindhā.

And when we take into consideration the fact that यत्त फल्गु बलं किञ्चित्तदत्रैवोपपद्यताम् । एतद्धि कृत्यं घोरं नो विक्रमेण प्रयुज्य ताम् ॥ (VI. 4 13) only able-bodied persons were allowed to join the distant-bound expeditions, we admit that the number simply staggers our imagination. And when we come to include the old and the decrepit, the young ones and the she-vānaras, who were left behind, the number goes up still higher. So after making due deductions from the poetic exaggeration indulged in by our poet, we cannot but admit that at that time Kiṣkindhā must have been one of the most thickly-populated parts of the world. And is it not probable that it was the numerical strength of the Vānaras alone that led the banished, the helpless Rāma to seek for their help in times of distress ?

Their past history—It is a well known fact that the present is the child of the past and that a nation without history is doomed. For it has nothing behind it to look back upon and to gather inspiration from. A nation without a past has no future before. If it be true of all nations, then it is true of the Vānaras too, for they claimed to be a nation. The Vānaras, it must be told, had a glorious past to look back upon and to draw inspiration from, for a still more brilliant future was anxiously waiting for them. We are told—

वानराणां प्रभावोऽयं न केन विदितः पुरा ।
देवतानां सकाशं च ये गच्छन्ति निमन्त्रिताः ॥

Who is not aware of the influence exerted by the Vānaras in olden times, as they used to go to the Devas on invitation ?

Then with regard to Jāmbavān, says Sāraṇa to Rāvaṇa—

एतेन साध्वं तु महत्कृतं शक्रस्य धीमता ।
देवासुरे जाम्बवता लब्धाश्च बहवो वराः ॥

(VI. 27. 12).

that he obtained numerous boons from Indra from rendering a yoeman's service to him during the Deva-Asura wars. Again, with regard to Sannādana we are told—

येन युद्धं तदा दत्तं रणे शक्रस्य धीमता ।
पराजयश्च न प्राप्तः सोऽयं यूथपयूथपः ॥

that he kept up an even fight with Indra ! Then with regard to Hanumān we are told how the newly born babe flew across 3000 Yojanas in an attempt to devour the rising Sun (VI. 28. 10-15). Again with reference to Vālin we are told that his admirers mourned bitterly remembering how after fighting for full fifteen years he did to death Golabha—the Gandharva Chief (IV. 22. 27-29) ! Tārā weeps remembering

या दत्ता देवराजेन तव तुष्टेन संयुगे ।
शातकौम्भीं प्रियां मालां तां ते पश्यामि नेह किम् ॥

(V. 23. 28).

how formerly being pleased with his skill in fighting, Indra awarded a golden garland to him !

Then how Vālin killed the Asura Māyavī, the son of Dundubhi in the depths of a dark cave after fighting with him for a year (IV 9. 1-22), and how he killed the buffalo-shaped Dānava, Dundubhi, who had challenged the Samudra and the Himavan to fight a duel with him (IV, 11-7-47), is known to every student of history. Lastly, how completely the king of the Vānaras outwitted the chief of

the Rākṣasas is known to every body (VII. 34. 11-34). Then Jāmbavān, while persuading Hanūmān to take the leap across the sea, describes his own achievements in by-gone days. Says he

त्रिविक्रमे मया तात सशैलवनकानना ।
त्रिःसप्तकृत्वः पृथिवी परिक्रान्ता प्रदक्षिणम् ॥
तदा चौषधयोऽस्माभिः संचिता देवशासनात् ।
निर्मथ्यममृतं याभिस्तदानीं नो महद्बलम् ॥

(IV. 66. 32-33).

When Viṣṇu was born as Vāmana, at that time I walked round this earth clad in hills and forests full 21 times, and being commanded by the Devas we gathered the medicinal herbs which being cast into the ocean and then churned, produced nectar.

It may not be out of place to mention here that it was this same Jāmbavān whose daughter Jambavatī was sought in marriage by Śrī Kṛṣṇa at a future date (Viṣṇu Purāṇa IV. 13, 31).

It was the brilliant achievement of the Vānaras such as these that had made their past glorious, and taking courage from these examples, the Vānaras of Rāma's age sought to make their future still brighter ! And it is about the life of these Vānaras that we are going to speak to-day,

Social organisation—Regarding the organisation of the Vānara-society, Vālmīki says

ते प्रधानेषु यूथेषु हरीणां हरियूथपाः ।
बभूवुर्यूथपश्रेष्ठान्वीरांश्चाजनयन्हरीन् ॥
अन्ये ऋक्षवतः प्रस्थानुपतस्थुः सहस्रशः ।
अन्ये नानाविधाञ्शैलकाननानि च भेजिरे ॥
सूर्यपुत्रं च सुग्रीवं शक्रपुत्रं च वालिनम् ।
भ्रातरावुपतस्थुस्ते सर्वे च हरियूथपाः ॥
नलं नीलं हनूमन्तमन्यांश्च हरियूथपान् ॥

(1. 17.30- 33).

These, foremost of the Vānaras, became the chiefs of different clans. These in their turn produced more Vānaras. Some retired to the sides of the Ṛkṣavān hills by thousands, while others took refuge in various hills and forests. But all Vānaras owed allegiance to Vālin, the son of Indra or to Sugrīva, the son of the Sun-god, either *directly*, or *indirectly* through such chiefs as Nala, Nīla or Hanūmān. It may be pointed out here with advantage that the ancient Vānara society resembled the ancient German Society in this respect, and our readers need not be told that here lay the seed of the Feudal system of the later age. In the Father-land, each and every German was bound to his lord so far as his *person* was concerned. He was obliged to work for him in times of peace in the home land, and follow him or fight for him in times of war in distant countries. This aspect of Feudalism is called by the historians the *personal* element. Later on, when land became plentiful, it at once became th tie that bound the vassal to the person of his lord. Even then the personal element was present there.

Now, these Vānaras were divided into three classes, *viz.*, the Ṛkṣas, the Vānaras and the Golāngūlas (1-17-19). It would have been interesting if we could have given a description of the personal appearance of the members of each of these three classes. But we regret to observe that our poet is almost silent on this point. Still a few words on this point may not be uninteresting.

The poet uses the word ऋक्ष at several places but never cares to give a description of the personal appearance of these. But with reference to Jāmbavān he uses the significant epithet हरिश्रेष्ठ: at one place (V. 57. 22). This leads me to think that the ऋक्षs were not bears, but that they were a class of Vānaras who used the figure of a bear as their totem like the North American Indians and the Australian Savages.

In this connection it should be noted that the word ऋरि is never used as a synonym for the word bear in the Sanskrit Language. But as the use is rather singular, I am afraid, I cannot speak with sufficient force.

With regard to the Golāṅgūlas, Saraṇa describes them in these words—

सितमुखा घोरा गोलांगुला महाबलाः ।

(VI. 27. 32)

the black-faced, the terrible and the powerful Golāṅgulas. With regard to the Vānaras it must be observed that they were of various colours. (IV. 37. 20-26)

Food and drink—The favourite sons of nature as these Vānaras were, they lived on the raw products of nature, such as fruits and roots. Though aware of the use of fire (IV. 5 12-16), it seems that the art of cooking had not made any progress in the Vānara society. Says Vālin to Rāma,—

फलमूलाशनं नित्यं वानरं वनगोचरम् ॥

(IV. 17-25)

We Vānaras are foresters by nature and live on fruits and roots. Again

वयं वनचरा राम मृगा मूलफलाशिनः ।
एषा प्रकृतिरस्माकं पुरुषस्त्वं नरेश्वर ॥
भूमिर्हिरण्यं रूपं च निग्रहे कारणानि च ।
तत्र कस्ते वने लोभो मदीयेषु फलेषु वा ॥

(IV. 19. 30-31).

O Lord of men, you are the perfect Being, while we foresters naturally live on roots and fruits. Land, gold and beauty are the perennial sources of quarrel, while our forests or their yields can hardly provoke you to open hostilities with us.

Then of the Vānaras who in response to Sugrīva's orders, came from the Himālayan regions, they, we are told, फलमूलेन जीवन्तः (IV. 37-23) lived on fruits and roots: and of those that came from the coast of the Kṣīroda Sea, we are told that they lived on cocoanuts (नारिकेलाशनाः, IV. 7.25).

Again of the expeditionary force that went to the South to fight with the Rākṣasas, we are told that they marched,

> अक्षयन्तः सुगन्धीनि मधूनि च फलानि च ।
> उद्वहन्तो महावृक्षान् मञ्जरीपुञ्जधारिणः ॥
>
> (IV. 4. 7)

subsisting on fruits and drinking the sweet-smelling Madhu (honey-wine) and carrying huge trees bedecked with clusters of stalks laden with fruits and flowers.

At the out-set, it must be told that the Vānaras were not the members of the Temperance Society and that they in accordance with the custom of the day very often used to take to drinking.

On the approach of the autumn, Rāma is justly angry with Sugrīva, for steeped in wine and women, he failed to locate the whereabouts of Sītā (IV. 30. 79). While Lakṣmaṇa was passing through Kiṣkindhā, the atmosphere of the streets was laden with the smell of maireya and madhu (IV. 33. 7). Sugrīva asks Hanūmān to send for the Vānaras of the Mahāruṇa hills who were hard drinkers of the maireya and madhu (IV. 37. 7).

The intoxicating effect of madhu on the Vānaras is a pleasant reading. After discovering Sītā in Laṅkā, Aṅgada's followers broke into the Madhuvana, the preserved forest of Sugrīva, and there they drank hard and then began to dance and frisk about, and sing and laugh and weep, recite aloud, and leap about (V. 61. 14-19). Then we are told that in this state they picked a quarrel with the guards and

roughly handled Dadhimukha, the officer-in-charge and his men (V. 62. 9-34).

Again, when the expeditionary force reached the Sahya hills, we are told that the Vānaras, as the result of another hard drink, pulled down the branches of the trees, uprooted creepers, roared aloud from the tops of trees and jumped from tree to tree (VI. 4 88-91). Among the Vānaras probably the practice was universal. Men as well as women, every body kissed the cup. We are told that Tārā, when she came out at the desire of Sugrīva to receive Lakṣmaṇa on his behalf, did not feel shy as she was in a drunken state (IV. 33. 40).

Dress—The Vānaras, it must be noted, were the inhabitants of a tropical country. So their dress suited the climatic conditions of the land in which they lived. Yet it displayed their aesthetic sense as well as their power of the purse.

Sugrīva complained bitterly of the conduct of Vālin when he said to his patron, Rāma, that—

एवमुक्त्वा तु मां तत्र वस्त्रेणैकेन वानरः ।
तदा निर्वासयामास वाली विगतसाध्वसः ॥

(IV. 10. 26)

he was banished by his powerful brother without a second cloth ! On the occasion of the encounter between the Vānara princes—Vālin and Sugrīva, we are told that—

सुग्रीवोऽप्यनदद्घोरं वालिनो ह्वानकारणात् ।
गाढ़ं परिहितो वेगान्नादैर्न्निन्दन्निवाम्बरम् ॥

(IV. 12. 15)

Sugrīva winding his cloth round the loin tightly bellowed the challenge to Vālin, tearing open the sky.

Again, immediately before the final encounter, Vālin finding Sugrīva ready for it, गाढं परिदधे वासो वाली परमकोपनः (IV. 16. 16) tightly wound the cloth round his waist.

On the completion of the crematin ceremony of Vālin, we are told that

ततः शोकाभिसंतप्तं सुग्रीवं क्लिन्नवाससम् ।
शाखामृगमहामात्राः परिवार्योपतस्थिरे ॥

(IV. 26. 1)

the high Vānara officials squatted round the grief-stricken Sugrīva who was then wearing wet clothes.

When Sitā for the first time saw Hanūmān in Laṅkā, she found him वेष्टितार्जुनवस्त्रम्, wearing a white cloth (V. 32. 1). Lastly on the occasion of Rāma's coronation ceremony Sitā was presented with two pieces of cloth, white like the moon's rays, and some beautiful ornaments by Rāma. It is said that she transferred these articles to Hanūmān, besides a necklace which she took out from her own person (VI. 128. 78-79). When Tārā at the desire of Sugrīva went out to placate the wrathful Lakṣmaṇa on behalf of her Lord, it is said that

सा प्रस्खलन्ती मदविह्वलाक्षी प्रलम्बकाञ्चीगुणहेमसूत्रा ।
सलक्षणा लक्ष्मणसन्निधानं जगाम तारा नमितांगयष्टिः ॥

(IV. 33. 38).

the auspicious Tārā with her person slightly bent down, approached Lakṣmaṇa with her steps unsteady and eyes rolling about, wearing a noble girdle-string round her zone and a long gold string dangling from her neck.

Again, on entering the harem of Sugrīva, Lakṣmaṇa is said to have found it well-supplied with noble-looking girls, possessed of beauty and youth, well-attired and richly decorated with ornaments, engaged in preparing garlands (IV. 33-22-23).

At the desire of Rāma and Sitā, the Vānara ladies of Sugrīva's harem dressed their persons lavishly before starting for Ayodhyā in the aerial car (VI. 123. 36).

Enough has been said above to show (I) that the Vānaras of the Tretā Age did not go about sky-clad like their present descendants ; (II) that both males and females probably used two pieces of cloths—the upper cloth and the loin cloth—like their Aryan Contemporaries ;

(III) that they did not use sewn garments prepared by the tailor.

It would be interesting here to compare the dress used by the Vānaras in the Purā Kalpa. The Padma Purāṇa (Pātāla Khaṇḍa) gives a resume of the Rāmāyaṇa as it was known in the Purā Kalpa. There we are told that the Vānaras were gold-coloured in appearance, that they used ear-rings, the sacrificial thread and that they wore a short piece of cloth over the privities—कौपीन, made of Maunji grass (Padma II-71-155). But just at present we are speakig of the Vānaras of the Tretā Age of the Varāha Kalpa. And it is just possible that in that age—though not universally, as is laid down in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa that शरीरत्राणकामो वै सोपानत्कः सदा व्रजेत् (III. 12. 38) those wishing to keep well should always walk with leathern shoes on ;—the Vānaras of the higher ranks at least actually used shoes. We find that on the occasion of Sugrīva's coronation ceremony, he was supplied with a pair of leathern shoes (IV 26–27).

And these Vānaras used ornaments made of gold and precious stones too. We are told that Vālin before going out to fight with Dundubhi, put on the necklace of gold (काञ्चन-माला) given him by Indra (IV. 11-39). Indeed our poet at one place describes the Lord of the Vānaras as हेममालिन्, (IV. 11. 61). This precious necklace of Vālin, we are told, was "made of gold and set with diamonds" (IV. 17-5). Of Sugrīva, we are told that 'when he bowed down at Rāma's

feet with great affection, his ornaments hung down' (from his neck) (IV. 12-6). Indeed Rāma in the course of the explanation given by him to Sugrīva as to why he did not kill Vālin during the first encounter says

> अलंकारेण वेषेण प्रमाणेन गतेन च ।
> त्वं च सुग्रीव वाली च सदृशौ स्थः परस्परम् ॥
>
> (IV. 12-30)

that the similarity between the two brothers was so very exact in the matter of ornaments, dress and motion, that he could not distinguish the one from the other.

Aṅgada, the crown-prince, has several times been described as कनकांगद, wearing a pair of gold bracelets on the upper arm (IV. 18.50). Later on we are assured that Vālin, too, had these ornaments on (IV. 20-24). Then it has already been pointed out above how Sītā on the occasion of Rāma's coronation ceremony gave a precious necklace to Hanūmān (VI. 128. 77-78).

As in ancient India, both males and females used the same ornaments to decorate their various limbs, we can safely conclude that the she-Vānaras too used the various ornaments noted above and represented to have been worn by the males. Only two ornaments remain to be noted here that have been used with reference to she-Vānaras only, and these are नूपुर and काञ्ची.

When Lakṣmaṇa entered the harem of Sugrīva, we are told (IV. 33. 25) that the noble-looking son of Sumitrā abashed on hearing the sound produced by the नूपुर (anklets) and काञ्ची (girdle-string) used by the inmates of the harem.

In connection with the same topic we are assured by the poet that these girls were liberally provided with beautiful ornaments (भूषणोत्तमभूषिताः IV. 33. 23). And it has already been noted above that when Tārā appeared before

Lakṣmaṇa, she was wearing a girdle-string and a chain of gold (IV. 33. 38).

The Vānaras were great lovers of scents and flowers. While Lakṣmaṇa was passing through the streets of Kiṣkindhā, he found the atmosphere surcharged with the sweet scent of the *aguru* sandal and lotus flowers (IV. 33-7).

Again Lakṣmaṇa found Sugrīva

दिव्याभरणचित्रांगं दिव्यरूपं यशस्विनम् ।
दिव्यमाल्याम्बरधरं महेन्द्रमिव दुर्जयम् ॥
दिव्याभरणमालाभिः समन्ततः । (IV. 33-64-65).

the glorious one, (seated) in the midst of his heavenly beauty, his limbs profusely decorated with ornaments and ointments, and surrounded by girls furnished with divine ornaments and unfading garlands.

And before speaking to Lakṣmaṇa, Sugrīva is said to have torn away

ततः कण्ठगतं माल्यं चित्रं बहुगुणं महत् (IV. 36-3)

the grand, multi-coloured and meritorious garland round his neck.

Manners and customs—Under this section I would quote instances to show that the Vānaras like all other civilised peoples of the world had a recognised code of etiquette to guide them in the society and that they were a civil and polite people.

Unlike the savages the Vānaras could distinguish the right from the wrong, and if they happened to offend any body, then instead of fighting with him for the purpose of upholding the wrong cause, they were ready to ask for a pardon. And how this was done is interesting to note. On the demise of Vālin, the inmates of his harem led by Tārā wept saying :

यद्यप्रियं किंचिदसंप्रधार्य कृतं मया स्यात्तव दीर्घबाहो ।
क्षमस्व मे तद्धरिवंशनाथ व्रजामि मूर्ध्ना तव वीर पादौ ॥
(IV. 20. 25).

Long armed Lord of the Vānara-race, if we have offended you in any way on an unguarded moment, then placing our heads at your feet we ask for a pardon.

And this is exactly what we do if we happen to offend a superior person !

Then in the matter of according a hearty reception to an honoured guest, these Vānaras yielded place to none. We are told of Sugrīva that as soon as Lakṣmaṇa appeared in sight,

उत्पपात हरिश्रेष्ठो हित्वा सौवर्णमासनम् ।
महान्महेन्द्रस्य यथा स्वलंकृत इव ध्वजः ॥
उत्पतन्तमनूत्पेतू रुमाप्रभृतयः स्त्रियः ।
सुग्रीवं गगने पूर्णं चन्द्रं तारागणा इव ॥
(IV. 34. 3—4)

Sugrīva, the best of the Vānaras, was up on his legs, leaving the seat of gold, like the richly decorated banner consecrated to Indra ; and he was followed by Rumā and other she-Vānaras even like the stars that follow the full moon.

Again when Sugrīva went to see Rāma for the first time after his coronation, it is said that on arriving at the spot where Rāma was waiting, he along with Lakṣmaṇa left the conveyance in which they were being carried ; then appearing before Rāma, he folded his hands together and his action was imitated by all the Vānaras present there. Rāma too, on finding the lord of the Vānaras humbly lying at his feet, raised him gently, embraced him affectionately and then asked him to take a seat (IV. 38. 15—19).

When Hanūmān returned from Laṅkā after tracing the whereabouts of Sītā, he was affectionately received by his grateful companions. On that occasion, it is said, finding Hanūmān dropping down from the sky, his companions waited with folded hands, and when he landed on the summit of that hill, all stood round him with beaming faces, some presented him with fruits and roots, some chattered aloud, while others ran for fetching branches of trees to sit on. Hanūmān then saluted the aged ones, such as Jāmbavān and others and the crown-prince Aṅgada. Then having been honoured by them, he communicated the success of his mission in a few, well-chosen words (V. 57. 28—36).

These Vānaras also knew the art of introducing themselves to unknown persons and leaving a lasting impression on their minds. When Hanūmān in the guise of a Bhikṣu (wanderer) approached Rāma for the first time, he began with humble salutations and profuse panegyrics (IV.3.3—4). In this way he was successful in rousing the confidence of Rāma. Again how Hanūmān was able to rouse the confidence of the much-persecuted Sītā, through his winning manners and guarded speech (V. 33—1ff), is known to everyone.

They also had the necessary training as to how best to conduct themselves in the presence of the superiors. Sugrīva while sending the Vānaras to every quarter of the globe in search of Sītā, first of all dismissed most of his Vānara chiefs, then humbly approaching his father-in-law Suṣeṇa, the father of Tārā, he humbly bowed down at his feet and with folded hands proposed to send him to the West at the head of a search-party (IV. 42. 1—6). Again in reply to the encomium bestowed on him by the old veteran Jāmbavān (VI 74. 21—23) when Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa had been mortally wounded by Indrajit, Hanūmān is said to have

humbly approached him, and then bowed down to him repeating his name (VI—74—24) . Again, while Rāma gave Hanūman his signet ring in order that he might have a free access to Sītā, Hanūmān taking it from Rāma, is said to have first of all put it on his hand, then *with folded hands saluted him,* touched his feet and departed (IV—44—15). Similarly, when Sītā gave him her crest-jewel for favor of carrying it to Rāma, on that occasion too Hanūmān having taken it from her, is said to have saluted her and then walking reverentially round her bowed down to her once more and then stood aside (V. 38—68) .

Indeed the custom of giving presents and accepting them was well-advanced in the Vānara—society. We are told, for instance, that the messengers despatched by Sugriva to convey the general mobilisation order, intentionally broke their journey on the Himālayas to gather the heavenly fruits and roots and medicinal herbs from the sacrificial grounds of Śiva to win the favor of their king (IV. 37. 31—32). Again, on the eve of Sugrīva's coronation, Hanūmān is said to have approached Rāma and persuaded him on behalf of his master to pay a visit to the town so that his liege-lord might get an opportunity to return thanks by making rich presents to him (IV—26—7).

These Vānaras also knew how to swear eternal friendship solemnly in the presence of the burning fire. We are told how in accordance with the advice of Kavandha (III. 72.—17—18) Rāma was desirous of entering into an alliance with Sugrīva. The scene is worth describing in full. Hence this attempt. "After Hanūman had formally introduced Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to Sugrīva, the latter stretched forth his arm and asked Rāma to hold it in his own if he was inclined to make friendship with a Vānara like him. Pursuant to his wishes Rāma pressed the offered hand in his own

and then embraced him affectionately. Hanūmān in the mean time had produced a fire by rubbing two pieces of wood together. Then having worshipped it duly, he placed it between the two. Lastly Rāma and Sugrīva walked round it solemnly. Thus the two entered that day into a life-long alliance, which death alone could separate" (IV. 5. 8—6). Sugrīva was justly proud of this fact, as he alludes to this later on

त्वं हि पाणिप्रदानेन वयस्यो मे ऽग्निसाक्षिकम् ।

(IV—8—27)

Thou art my sworn friend, who hast offered his hand in eternal friendship. In this connection it should be noted that Rāvaṇa too after his discomfiture in the hands of Vālin is said to have sworn eternal friendship to his victor in the presence of the fire (VII—34—42) .

The rites and ceremonies connected with the coronation ceremony of Sugrīva deserve to be quoted in full ; we are told that "the partisans of Sugrīva collected the articles required for the ceremony, viz. a white umbrella, worked in gold ; a pair of fly-whisks furnished with rods of gold, various kinds of precious stones, seeds, medicinal herbs, the tender shoots and flowers of trees yielding milk, white clothes, white unguent (अनुलेपन), scents, wreaths, lilies and lotuses, sandal-paste, various kinds of scents, fried grains (अक्षतम्), gold, प्रियंगु seeds, honey, clarified butter, curd, tiger skin, and a pair of costly shoes.

"The ceremony actually commenced with the appearance of sixteen maidens who held in their hands such auspicious articles as the मनःशिला (Red Arsenic—Wilson) and गोरोचना (a bright yellow pigment found in the head of a cow ; or prepared from the urine of the animal-ibid). Then having propitiated the noble Brāhmaṇas with gifts of precious stones,

clothes and food, they proceeded to instal the best of the Vānaras on the throne. Next, Brāhmaṇas well-versed in the Mantra-lore offered oblations to the burning fire in accordance with the prescribed rites. This was followed by the pouring of scented water brought from various holy rivers and seas in gold pitchers and bullhorns by the various Vānara-chiefs on the head of Sugrīva who was seated (on a seat of gold, covered with a beautiful cover), facing the east at the top of the palace that had been profusely decorated for the occasion". And we are assured by the poet that the whole ceremony was conducted on the lines recommended by the Śāstras and the foremost of the soges (IV. 26. 22—36).

In this connection I should like to tell the readers how the Vānaras disposed of their dead. Fortunately Vālmīki has given a faithful description of the rites and ceremonies connected with the cremation of Vālin and we can only quote *it in extenso* to satisfy our curious readers. We are told that Lakṣmaṇa asked Sugrīva to employ the Vānaras in collecting a large quantity of dry wood and sandal-wood too, and to request the crown-Prince to fetch garlands, different kinds of cloths, clarified butter, oil and scents. Then he asked Tārā to get a conveyance (शिविका) and to ask the bearers to get ready.

(IV. 25. 12—19)

"On the arrival of the richly decorated and well furnished conveyance Sugrīva and Aṅgada placed the corpse of Vālin, gorgeously attired, garlanded and duly ornamented, in it. In accordance with the instructions of Sugrīva the bier was carried to the river-side preceded by the Vānaras who scattered precious stones of different kinds and followed by Tārā and other wives of the dead chief weeping bitterly.

(IV. 25. 28—36)

"Then a large number of Vānaras constructed the funeral pyre on the solitary bank of a hill-stream, lashed by water ; meanwhile the bearers placing the bier on the ground waited at a *lonely spot with a heavy heart* (IV. 25. 37-39).

" Shortly afterwards Aṅgada and Sugrīva with an aching heart laid the corpse on the pyre. Aṅgada at last set fire to it and walked round the burning pyre according to the prescribed rites. Then all the Vānaras headed by Aṅgada, Tārā and Sugrīva walked into the river to offer water in memory of the departed soul under the guidance of Rāma (IV. 25. 49-53).

Town and Town life—India from the very dawn of her history has been an agricultural country. This circumstance has forced her sons to live in small-sized, scattered villages and hamlets. If this has been true of her human children, it applied with double force in the case of her Vānara children. These Vānaras, as has already been told, mainly dwelt on the summits of hills and in jungles. But when we speak of the Vānaras organised politically, of a Vānara Kingdom, it at once reminds us of the Vānara Capital, for in Ancient India every little blessed kingdom had a capital of its own. Its size, its importance or its population did not matter much. Yet it was the Capital where the king with his little court resided.

This Kiṣkindhā was the little capital of the mighty Vānara kingdom. The poet is very liberal in the use of high-sounding epithets to describe this town. For instance, he calls it resplendent without a match अतुलप्रभा (IV. 11. 21), protected by the valour of Vālin (IV. 13. 1), nursed by the prowess of the son of Indra (IV. 13. 30), beauteous (IV. 26. 19), unassailable (दुराधर्षा IV. 13. 29), unattainable (दुरासदा IV. 31 26) and so on. Besides impressing his readers with its dignity and might, the poet also gives

us some information regarding its position, defence and beauty. More than once he calls it a little town (IV. 16. 13). Then he tells us that it was situated in cave (1. 1. 67 ; IV. 26. 41) near the Prasravaṇa hills (IV. 27. 26). This town, as was customary in Ancient India, was provided with the city gates (IV. 9. 5 ; IV. 11. 26. 27) and surrounded by walls and moats (IV. 31. 27). It was defended by forts (IV. 19. 15), bristling with a net-work of Vānaras, decorated with gold and studded with banners and machines (IV. 14. 5-6)—a great city difficult of access and full of armies (IV. 31 16). Again, while introducing Sugrīva to Rāvaṇa Śuka describes Kiṣkindhā in the following words. Accompanied by his chieftains, he dwells in the fort of Kiṣkindhā, clad in dense forests and the most inaccessible of all hill-forts.*

---

* In this connection the testimony of Brahman is worth considering. Says he—

गच्छ मद्वचनाद्दूत किष्किन्धां नाम वै शुभाम् ।
सा ह्यस्य गुणसम्पन्ना महती च पुरी शुभा ॥
तव वानरयूथानि सुबहूनि वसन्ति च ।
बहुरत्नसमाकीर्णा वानरैः कामरूपिभिः ॥
पुण्या पुण्यवती दुर्गा चातुर्वर्ण्यपुरस्कृता ।
विश्वकर्मकृता दिव्या मन्नियोगाच्च शोभना ॥

(VII. 37 (A). 47—49.).

Messenger, you take (Ṛkṣa-Rāja) to the beautiful town named Kiṣkindhā. It is extensive, meritorious and it would be the source of his prosperity, because it is the habitat of numerous Vānaras. Viśva Karman constructed that beautiful, holy and divine town at my desire. It is inaccessible, full of articles of merchandise, abounding in costly jewels, the home of all the four Varṇas as well as of the Vānaras.

Yet the defence-works mentioned above did not mar its beauty, for we are told that it was well-provided with gardens (IV. 27—26.), abounding in gems, heavenly, adorned with flowering gardens and beautiful (IV. 33—4), full of charming palaces and mansions, decorated with various precious stones and embellished with all sorts of flowering trees that produced fruits whenever wished for (IV. 33—5), and crowded with Vānaras decently clad and wearing unfading garlands, who could assume various forms at will (IV. 33—6).

Such then was Kiṣkindhā, the mighty little Capital of a mighter nation; and as for the life that vibrated therein we cannot do better than quote in full as it appeared to Lakṣmaṇa while he was going to the Palace passing through the streets for demanding an explanation from Sugrīva for his dilatoriness. "On receiving the formal permission of Sugrīva, Lakṣmaṇa at the desire of Rāma entered Kiṣkindhā situated in the midst of a cave. At his sight the guards at the gateway waited quietly with folded hands. But finding him in a distemper, they dared not follow him. Lakṣmaṇa on entering that spacious cave found it studded with precious stones, well-provided with flower-gardens, thickly beset with closely-built palaces and mansions, decorated with all sorts of jewels, embellished with all sorts of desire-yielding trees, crowded with Vānaras, the children of the Devas and the Gandharvas-all decently clad and wearing divine garlands, assuming various forms at will, and noble-looking, —and the atmosphere of the streets was laden with the sweet smell of Madhu.

"He then passes by the beautifully white mansions belonging to the various Vānara chiefs, resplendent like the clouds, adorned with sweet-smelling garlands, abounding in wealth and grains and liberally supplied with beautiful

women. Shortly afterwards he found himself standing before the palace of Sugrīva, surrounded by a white wall built of crystal stones ; looking like Indra's palace, white-capped like the summit of the Kailāsa hills ; thickly planted with the desire-yielding, flowering, fruit-giving shady Kalpa trees, that came as a present from Indra and charming like the inky cloud pregnant with water ; closely watched by strong Vānaras carrying weapons, adorned with unfading garlands and having a porch made of molten gold.

" Lakṣmaṇa next entered unrestricted into the harem of the Vānara prince even like-the noon-day sun darting through the thick layers of clouds. He found it handsomely furnished with bedsteads and comfortable seats made of gold and silver. There he heard the strains of melodious music, both vocal and instrumental, rich in keeping time, wording and ornamentation. He also came across numerous girls there possessed of youth and beauty, nobly descended and well-supplied with raiments and ornaments, engaged in manufacturing garlands ; also he saw there some of the attendants of Sugrīva who appeared contented, ever-ready to carry out orders and moderately provided with ornaments " (IV. 33-1-24). Such was the life that the Vānaras led in their Capital.

Morals.—If right conduct has the public weal for its ultimate object then the best synonym that I could suggest for the English term morals would be सदाचार। For सदाचार has also the same object in view (Manu II 5). Now this सदाचार has been defined as follows :

साधवः क्षीणदोषास्तु सच्छब्दः साधुवाचकः ।
तेषामाचरणं यत्तु सदाचारः स उच्यते ॥

(Viṣṇu Purāṇa III 11—3.)

The term सत् stands for good men, and only such men are called good as are faultless. The conduct pursued by such men is called सदाचार ।

In this connection it would be interesting to note the authorities whose conduct was considered right by the Ancient Āryas. Says the same Purāṇa—

सप्तर्षयोऽथ मनवः प्रजानां पतयस्तथा ।
सदाचारस्य वक्तारः कर्त्तारश्च महीपते ॥

(Ibid, III. 11-4)

O King, the seven Ṛṣis, the Manus and the Prajāpatis enunciated and practised the code of Right Conduct.

The only remark that I should like to make here is the that these sages laid down the code of Right conduct for advancing the common weal of the Aryan population of India. They were not competent enough to be followed by all the tribes and nations that lived in India at that time, for the standard of morality has varied from people to people and tribe to tribe. For what is sauce for the gander, has never been the sauce for the goose ! In spite of this fact if the Aryan standard of morality came to be adopted in India generally, it goes to prove the mighty move taken by Aryan Imperialism in bye-gone days. But whatever differences there may be in details, the moral standard of each and every people aims at securing the common-weal for all its members. Expressed in other words it would mean that the moral standard adopted by certain people is the result of long-standing custom, it has the sanction of ages behind it. Therefore however disgusting may the morals of a certain people appear to be at first sight to an outsider, it must be remembered that these have a tradition behind them and as such they ought to be respected. Did Procustus' bed fit anybody and every body that happened to lie on it ?

The moral history of mankind begins with a promiscuous relation between man and woman. There was a time in the history of every old-world nation when man was the slave of his instinct, and in the matter of sexual relation with woman, he played the animal. But after some time, probably with a view to establish the common-weal by making an end of petty jealousies and bickerings for the sake of woman, man reduced her to serfdom to carry out his whims and fancies by tying her to his person in an artificial bond that goes by the name of marriage. Still nature had her way and man was not satisfied with one woman. This consideration combined with economic pressure gave rise to the system of polygamy. What is true of all nations is true of India too. Says the Skanda Purāṇa—

"Formerly women indulged in promiscuity. But for the purity of the rising generation Vṛhaspati transferred a fourth part of Indra's sin to them, thus checking promiscuity" (1-16-41).

The case of Jābāli (Chhāndogya IV. 4-1-4) is so well-known that it needs no repetition here.

Then how the great sage Śvetaketu came to establish the institution of marriage in the Aryan society in India is vividly descriped in the Mahābhārata (1—128—12).

I am strongly inclined to suspect that the Rāmāyaṇa speaks of that particular period of Vānara history when in their society at least, promiscuity reigned supreme; when the idea of respecting female chastity had made little head-way. Yet their society was not matriarchal and there was extant the institution of formal marriage among them.

The originator of the Vānara Royal House was Ṛkṣarāṭ. His origin as well as those of Vālin and Sugrīva are all shrouded in mystery. It is said that born of a drop of tear

that trickled down the cheek of Brahmā, Ṛkṣarāṭ was deputed to rule over the Vānaras in Kiṣkindhā. After some time he is said to have plunged into a lake to fight with an imaginary foe. But lo! when he came out of water, he remained no longer a male being, instead he had been translated into an attractive girl. Fortunately there were passing by that way our gallant Indra and the all-powerful Sun. Finding that beautiful girl in such a lonely spot, naturally they grew passionate; and as the girl did not yield to their embraces easily, the poor souls deposited their semen, one on her head and the other on her neck. Thus were born Vālin and Sugrīva from Indra and the Sun respectively (VII—37—A 8ff). Now, this event of a man being changed into a woman is by no means singular. We are at once reminded of the peculiar case of Rājā Sudyumna who having offended Pārvati by trespassing into her garden, was at once changed into a woman named Ilā. But by favour of Śiva he was again turned into a man. Later on he used to become a man and a woman alternately for a month (Śiva Purāṇa, I. 62. 13 ff). Similar was the case of the Brāhmaṇa youth Soma Vana, who disguised as a woman is said to have cheated the Queen Sīmantinī at the desire of the Rājā of Vidarbha. Therefore he too was changed into a woman for good (Skanda, III (c) 9. 2 ff).

Indeed, the Vānaras even stooped to incestuous sins, and we are pained to find Sugrīva acknowledging the sin as a matter of course as if he had done nothing unusual. While narrating to Rāma his previous history, says he, he waited patiently for full one year at the entrance of the hole for the return of Vālin when the latter was having a contest with Dundubhi in the depths of it. When he did not come out, he returned to Kiṣkindhā and appropriated the extensive kingdom along with Rumā, his own wife, and Tārā, the wife

of Vālin (IV—46—3—9). Then when Vālin suspecting foul play on the part of his brother exiled him, in retaliation Vālin is said to have paid him in his own coin by appropriating Rumā, the wife of Sugrīva. And the wretched Sugrīva complains to Rāma in these words :

ऋष्यमूकं गिरिवरं भार्याहरणदुःखितः ।
प्रविष्टोऽस्मि दुराधर्षं वालिनः कारणान्तरे ॥

(IV—10—28)

Being grieved at the forcible appropriation of my wife, I have taken refuge in the Ṛsyamūka hills, because these regions are inaccessible to him (on account of Matanga's curse).

And Rāma having been supplied with the queen, admonished his fallen enemy in these words :

तदेतत्कारणं पश्य यदर्थं त्वं मया हतः ।
भ्रातुर्वर्तसे भार्यायां त्यक्त्वा धर्मं सनातनम् ॥
अस्य त्वं धरमाणस्य सुग्रीवस्य महात्मनः ।
रुमायां वर्तसे कामात् स्नुषायां पापकर्मकृत् ॥
तद्व्यतीतस्य ते धर्मात्कामवृत्तस्य वानर ।
भ्रातृभार्याभिमर्शेऽस्मिन्दण्डोऽयं प्रतिपादितः ॥
औरसीं भगिनीं वापि भार्यां वाप्यनुजस्य यः ।
प्रचरेत नरः कामात्तस्य दण्डो वधः स्मृतः ॥

(IV—18—18 ff.)

Overstepping the laws laid down in the Religion Eternal, you are guilty of an incestuous sin with your brother's wife, and this was the reason that led me to kill you. O sinner, impelled by Desire, you have violated the chastity of the wife of the high-souled Sugrīva who is your younger brother ; for breaking the laws laid down by the religion, this is the punishment that I am pleased to award..................... ....Death is the only punishment recommended for

such sinners as violate the chastity of their natural sisters or sisters-in-law.

We frankly confess our inability to follow the line of reasoning advanced by Rāma, remembering the fact that it was his ally, Sugrīva, who led the way, and the poor Vālin simply followed his footsteps ! Elsewhere he says that he had killed him without giving a previous notice because he was only a शाखामृग (a monkey) (IV—18—40). Supposing that he was one, how could Rāma exact the moral standard observed by human beings from a monkey ?

Again, on the death of Vālin, Sugrīva once more laid his hands on Tārā, and this time permanently ; nor did he forget to reclaim his own wife, Rumā. On the approach of the autumn season, Hanūmān found Sugrīva—

स्वां च पत्नीमभिप्रेतां तारां चापि समीप्सिताम् ।
विहरन्तमहोरात्रं कृतार्थं विगतज्वरम् ॥

enjoying the company of his beloved wife and that of the equally beloved Tārā, day and night and without ennui.

Again Sugriva is said to have turned a deaf ear to the reports of the Vānara guards who brought the news of Lakṣmaṇa's visit to Kiṣkindhā. Indeed Tārā freely admitted the fact in the presence of Lakṣmaṇa, when she said—

रामप्रसादात्कीर्त्तिं च कपिराज्यं च शाश्वतम् ।
प्राप्तवानिह सुग्रीवो रुमां मां च परंतप ॥
(IV-35-5)

O Queller of enemies, Sugrīva has earned undying glory, the kingdom of the Vānaras, Rumā and myself through Rāma's favour.

Again, the circumstance of Hanūmān's birth is also an interesting reading. He was, says Jāmbavān, the natural son of the Wind-God and the deputed (क्षेत्रज) one of Keśarī—a Vānara chief, born of the latter's wife Puñjikasthalā,

(IV-66-29-30). Hanūmān seems to have taken a glory in the fact, for he introduced himself to Sītā in these words :—

तस्याहं हरिणः क्षेत्रे जातो वातेन मैथिलि ।
हनूमानिति विख्यातो लोके स्वेनैव कर्मणा ॥

(V-35-81)

I was born of the wife of Keśarī and begotten by Pavana. I am known to the world as Hanūmān through my work.

The circumstances of his birth, however, were as follows :—

"The renowned Apsarā Puñjikasthalā alias Añjanā was born as a she—Vānara on account of a curse. She was married later on to the Vānara chief Keśarī. One day while, assuming the form of a human being, she was walking about in a leisurely fashion on the top of a hill, the Wind-God gradually removed her wearing apparel made of silk. Then there she stood in all her glory like the Temptation incarnate. It was too much for the Wind-God, and the love-sick gallant at once violated her. She made a feeble protest against this unseemly conduct of the assailant, but she was soon brought round when promised a son as valiant, intelligent and swift as the God himself. Here it should be noted that the contact is said to have been only mental and not physical. Immediately afterwards Puñjikasthalā is said to have given birth to Hanūmān in a lonely cave."

(IV-66-8-20).

Certainly in ancient India begetting children "by deputation" was a recognised institution. But the rules pertaining to this custom were rather strict, lest they should run into corruption. Manu distinctly says that this system was introduced during the reign of Vena, but proscribed very soon afterwards, for it caused confusion of castes. It is for this very reason that he condemns the practice (IX-64-68).

But we know that its death was slow. And the Purāṇas preserve numerous cases where children were actually begotten "by appointment." We know that Vaṣiṣṭha for the continuance of the Ikṣvāku line, produced the Prince Aśmaka from the wife of king Kalmāṣapāda (Vāyu, 88-177), that Vyāsa produced Dhṛta rāṣṭra, Pāṇḍu and Vidura from the soil owned by the late king Vicitra-Virya (Matsya. 50-44-47). The instances may be multiplied.

But to my mind the case in hand is one of clear indiscrimination on the part of Vāyu as well as Añjanā. For who "deputed" Vāyu to produce a child on his behalf? Again, the severest criterion on this system seems to have been that the 'deputed' man should approach the woman devoid of passion, as had actually been done by the Kṣattriya women—after the annihilation of the Kṣattriya males at the hands of Paraśurāma (Skanda, V -128-20). But in the present case we are distinctly told that

दृष्ट्वैव शुभसर्वाङ्गीं पवनः काममोहितः ।
स तां भुजाभ्यां दीर्घाभ्यां पर्यष्वजत मारुतः ॥

As soon as the Wind-God saw the perfect limbed one, he became love-sick and embraced her with his long arms.

But though promiscuous in sexual matters, these Vānaras had a keen moral sense that really rouses our admiration. While thinking of taking to starvation for having failed to trace the whereabouts ot Sītā, says the crown-prince Aṅgada,

भ्रातुर्ज्येष्ठस्य यो भार्यां जीवतो महिषीं प्रियाम् ।
धर्मेण मातरं यस्तु स्वीकरोति जुगुप्सितः ॥
कथं स धर्मं जानीते ।

(IV-55-3-4.)

The wife of the elder brother should be looked up to like one's mother, and woe be to him—who violates her during the life-time of his elder brother. Such a person cannot be credited with the knowledge of the Dharma.

Again when the Wind-God had secured her person energetically with his 'long-arms' and when the 'soul had met the soul' (गतात्मा), the she-Vānara Añjanā is said to have protested against this unseemly conduct of the all-powerful God in these words :

एकपत्नीव्रतमिदं को नाशयितुमिच्छति ॥

(IV.66-16.)

who is it that dares violate my chastity ? Again, engaged in prying into the harem of Rāvaṇa, Hanūmān is said to have paid a visit to the drinking house attached to the Palace. There he came across a whole bevy of beautiful girls, the inmates in Rāvaṇa's harem, sleeping off the intoxication produced by the drink. Naturally they were all lying in a disorderly fashion, with their clothes displaced from the proper position. At this sight Hanūmān's conscience rebels and he thinks in this strain :

परदारावरोधस्य प्रसुप्तस्य निरीक्षणम् ।
इदं खलु ममात्यर्थं धर्मलोपं करिष्यति ॥
न हि मे परदाराणां दृष्टिर्विषयवर्तिनी ।
अयं चात्र मया दृष्टः परदारपरिग्रहः ॥

The sight of the sleeping inmates of an unknown person's harem would certainly result in a loss of virtue, for never have I designed to cast my eyes on the women belonging to others. Besides, I saw here one guilty of dishonouring another person's wife. But very soon he recovered the balance of his mind, for

8

कामं दृष्टा मया सर्वा विश्वस्ता रावणस्त्रियः ।
न तु मे मनसा किञ्चिद्वैकृत्यमुपपद्यते ॥
मनो हि हेतुः सर्वेषामिन्द्रियाणां प्रवर्तने ।
शुभाशुभास्ववस्थासु तच्च मे सुव्यवस्थितम् ॥

(V-11-41-42)

Minutely did I see the women of Rāvaṇa, at a time when they did not expect me; but for all that my mind is as pure as ever. The mind is the agent—that moves the senses in producing good or evil conditions and that agent is well in my hand.

Probably this was the reason that led the poet to call him self-controlled (आत्मवान् V. I. 196; V-61-4) more than once.

The Vānaras also knew how to be grateful. In reply to the severe indictment levelled against Sugrīva by the hot-headed Lakṣmaṇa, Tarā vindicated his character in these words :

नैवाकृतज्ञः सुग्रीवो न शठो नापि दारुणः ।
नैवानृतकथो वीरो न जिह्मश्च कपीश्वरः ॥
उपकारं कृतं वीरो नाप्ययं विस्मृतः कपिः ।

This lord of the Vānaras must not be taken for an ungrateful, or a deceitful, or a rude, or an untruthful or an insincere being; nor has he forgotten the good turn done him by Rāma.

They also knew how to forget that stern daughter of God-Duty, when steeped in wine and women. And we are told how Sugrīva spent the whole of the rainy season in the company of women without doing anything for Rāma, and it required the Herculean strength of a wrathful Lakṣmaṇa to rouse him from the stupor. Indeed, Tārā defends his conduct in these words ;

न कामतन्त्रे तव बुद्धिरस्ति त्वं वै यथा मन्युवशं प्रपन्नः ।
न देशकालौ हि यथार्थधर्माववेक्षते कामरतिर्मनुष्यः ॥
तं कामवृत्तं मम संनिकृष्टं कामाभियोगाच्च विमुक्तलज्जम् ।
क्षमस्व तावत्परवीरहन्तस्त्वद्भ्रातरं वानरवंशनाथम् ॥
महर्षयो धर्मतपोभिरामाः कामानुकामाः प्रतिबद्धमोहाः ।
अयं प्रकृत्या चपलः कपिस्तु कथं न सज्जेत सुखेषु राजा ॥

(IV– 33-55-57).

You have been angry with Sugrīva finding him attached to desire, for you have all along kept yourself strenuously aloof from the Path of Desire ; even when men come to lose their power of discretion when steeped in pleasure,—and the great sages, always engaged in asceticism and religious duties, out of desire, are overpowered by sweet Forgetfulness,—then why should not this Lord of the Vānaras, by nature fickle-minded, lose himself in pleasure ? Therefore, O destroyer of the heroes on the enemy side, it behoves you to excuse Sugrīva who shamelessly follows the path of Desire, is devoted to me through passion, even like a brother of your own !

Thus, then, were the Vānaras of old, almost divine in displaying their strength of character, and mostly human on the erring side

Religion—Besides giving the much sought-for peace of mind, the religion followed by a certain people goes to bind together the detached members into a homogeneous whole. It comes to supply one of those ties that makes a nation of a certain people. In the case of the Vānaras we are not sure if this seeming side of the utility of Religion played an important part, but we are sure that it went to satisfy the hunger of their hearts and that it supplied the necessary strength wherewith to overcome obstacles.

At the outset it must be told that Vālmiki conceived these Vānaras to have been the children of Aryan Gods. As such it was only natural for them to pour forth the ardent devotion of their hearts at the feet of the gods recognised by the Āryas of old. Thus indirectly it throws some light on the religious beliefs of our forefathers in the Rāmāyanic Age.

"Before taking a leap across the sea from the Mahendra Hills, Hanūmān is said to have prayed to Sūrya, Mahendra, Pavana, the Self-born One, and other beings worthy of receiving obeisance. Then he is said to have turned to the east and bowed down to his father Vāyu" (V- 1- 8- 9).

Similarly before entering the Aśoka Park, he is said to have "prayed to the Self-born One. Agni, Vāyu, Indra who carries the thunder-bolt, Varuṇa who carries the noose, the Moon, the Sun, the Aśvins, the Maruts, the Ṛṣis and the Lord of all Beings-for the success of his mission."

(V—13—62—65).

" Before stepping into the gardens, he thinks of saluting the Vasus, the Rudras, the Ādityas, the Aśvin twins and the Maruts (V—13—54).

Then he proceeded to salute Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, Sītā, Rudra, Indra, Yama, Vāyu, Candra, Agni and the Maruts".

(V—13—57)

These then were some of the deities worshipped by the Vānaras as well as the Āryas of old. But this list is certainly not exhaustive and it is just postible that there were many more who shared with the above-mentioned gods the devotion and attachment of the Vānaras.

Indeed, we are amused to find these Vānaras divided into several religious sects. For instance, we are told that the Vānara chief Rambha was an ardent devotee of Indra (VI-27-16), then with reference to the Vānara Lord Śata-vali,

Śuka informs Rāvaṇa that he was a Sun-worshipper (VI-27-44). Thus the seed of the cult of Bhakti was there.

Now we will proceed to describe some of the rites and ceremonies connected with their religion. It has already been noted that they believed in the efficacy of offering water in honour of the departed souls (IV-25-52-53), and that they also gladly followed the lead of the Brāhmaṇas whose services were in request at the time of religious ceremonies specially. We have seen how they were propitiated by Sugrīva on the occasion of his coronation ceremony and how they conducted the religious rites connected therewith (IV-25-14 ff). We also know that Vālin used to visit the four seas daily to perform the Sandhyā prayers and on that occasion we are told that he used to repeat the Vedic mantras (नैगमान्मन्त्रान्) (VII-34-16-18). Again before Vālin went to have the final encounter with his brother Sugrīva, Tārā, we know, dismissed him after formally walking round him and performing the auspicious rites (known as the स्वस्त्ययन) in accordance with the prescribed form (IV-16-11-12). Similarly, before Hanūmān took a leap across the sea, the venerable Jāmbavān is said to have encouraged him in these words: " In conformity with the opinion expressed by the Vānara Nestors and by favour of the Ṛṣis, we will all perform the auspicious rites for the success of your mission. Take leap across the sea and we will wait for you *on one leg* anxiously looking for your return" (IV-67-33-34).

Then, the search party sent to the south under the lead of Aṅgada failing to discover the whereabouts of Sītā, for fear of losing their lives if they returned unsuccessful to Kiṣkindhā, determined to lay down their lives by taking to starvation (प्रायोपवेशनम्). On that occasion taking leave of one another, each squatted on the sea-coast, on a seat

made of the Kuśa grass, the ends of which pointed to the south, with his face turned to the east and having touched water ceremonially (IV-55-20).

The readers' attention here is drawn to the fact that Rāma, too, did exactly the same thing to propitiate the Sea-God before he crossed over to Lankā (VI-21-1-11), and we are told that the valiant Parīkṣita, too, did the same thing when cursed to die bitten by the Takṣaka (Bhāgavata, 1-19-17).

We propose to take leave of this topic after citing a case of the spirit of religious intoleration displayed by Hanūmān on the occasion of his first visit to Lankā. After discovering Sītā in the Aśoka Park, Hanūmān wanted to test the fighting strength of Rāvaṇa. So it is represented that he laid waste the fine Park, thus taking the offensive (V-41-1-21). This fact was duly reported to Rāvaṇa by the Rākṣasī guards of Sītā (V-42-3-5). When opposed by the king's own *Kinkara* guards, he is said to have destroyed them fighting with an iron bar (V·42·27-42). Next, we are told, he proceeded to demolish the caitya temple of the Rākṣasas, which he actually burnt down, and killed the guards (V-43-1-25). I mention this fact because in ancient India, religious persecution was rarely resorted to.

Thus, in the field of religion at least, these Vānaras resembled the Aryans more than in any thing else.

Education—That the Vānaras detested to starve out their brains is amply manifested by the fact that they had culture which was all their own. That they studied divers subjects may be ascertained by a reference to the text. The poet uses here and there different epithets to describe Sugrīva—I mean his character and attainments, and here are some of these. We are told that he was अमितप्रभः, सत्यसंधः,

विनीतः, धृतिमान्, मतिमान्, and महान् (III-72-13), illustrious without a parallel, adhering to the truth, humble, patient, intelligent, and great. Again दक्षः, प्रगल्भः, द्युतिमान्, महाबल-पराक्रमः (III-72-14) and कृतज्ञः, (III-72-14). Elsewhere he is referred to as धर्मात्मा (IV-3-22) religious, विद्वान् (IV-7-25) learned, प्रकृत्या निपुणः बुद्धिमांश्च (IV-15-14), skilful and wise by nature; रणकोविदः (IV-16-19) a skilful soldier, मनस्विन् (IV-29-7), knowing the true sense of the words and आत्मवान् (IV-32-1), self controlled. Further on we are told that he was नित्यंपण्डितः (VI 19-36), behaving like a learned man in every day affairs, अदीनसत्त्वः (VI-20-22), high-spirited, प्रियवादिन् (39-4) sweet-tongued, सर्वज्ञः (IV 43-2) all-knowing, वाक्यविशारदः (V-63-15), skilful in the use of words, and अर्थवित्तमः (IV-40-15) well-versed in the science of Politics. Then Sugrīva at one place addressed the Vānara chief Śatavala as अर्थविदांवर. (IV-43-5), the Prince of the Politicians. Similarly our Poet at one place speaks of Jāmbavān as अर्थवित् (V-60-14.) well-versed in the science of Politics He also employs the following epithets to describe him, viz. वाक्यकोविदः (IV-65-20), skilful in the use of words, महाप्राज्ञः (IV-65-28), highly intelligent, and शास्त्रबुद्ध्या विचक्षणः (VI-17-45), well read in the Śāstras.

With regard to Hanūmān, we are fortunate enough to have in possession the names of certain definite subjects in which he is said to have attained proficiency. To propitiate Vāyu, the Sun-god is said to have granted the following boon to Hanūmān: यदा च शास्त्राण्यध्येतुं शक्तिरस्य भविष्यति । तदास्य शास्त्रं दास्यामि येन वाग्मी भविष्यति ॥ (VII 36. 4)

When he becomes capable of studying the Śāstras, I shall teach him in such a way that he becomes an elocutionist.

Then during the period of Sugrīva's exile from Kiṣkindhā, he is said to have "traversed the whole earth, from the Udaya-giri to the Astācala urged on by a vehement desire to learn the Vyākaraṇa. In a very short time this matchless Vānara attained perfection in all the branches of this particular subject-viz the Sūtras, Vṛttis, notes thereon, and the appendices (संग्रह)" (VII 36-44—45). Consequently we are assured,

न ह्यस्य कश्चित्सदृशोऽस्ति शास्त्रे वैशारदे छन्दगतौ तथैव ॥
सर्वासु विद्यासु तपोविधाने प्रस्पर्धतेऽयं हि गुरुं सुराणाम् ।

(VII-36-45-46)

nobody excelled him in the knowlenge of the Śāstras, as well as in the Science of the composition of the Vedic mantras (छन्दस्). He could even challenge the preceptor of the Devas in the knowledge of all the Vidyās as well as in the matter of the rites and ceremonies connected with asceticism

Again, being profoundly impressed with the indroductory speech delivered by Hanūmān, on the occasion of his first visit to the exiled princes, Rāma is said to have remarked :

नानृग्वेदविनीतस्य नायजुर्वेदधारिणः ।
नासामवेदविदुषः शक्यमेवं विभाषितुम् ॥
नूनं व्याकरणं कृत्स्नमनेन वहुधा श्रुतम् ।
वहु व्याहरतानेन न किञ्चिदपशब्दितम् ॥

(IV. 3. 28-29)

A man unacquainted with the contents the Ṛk, the Yajus and the Sāman, cannot speak like that. It is certain that he must have studied the Vyākaraṇa several times thoroughly, for in course of his long speech, he has not misused a single word. Thus we have seen that the Vānaras studied definite subjects with an eye to their utility in the practical field. Here a word about the language used by

them may not be considered irrelevant. It is just possible that at that time in India the mass of the people used the variant forms of Prakrit in their daily life, whereas the learned folk in their formal talks most probably used the refined Sanskrit in conformity with the rules of grammar. For instance, Hanumān on the occasion of his first visit to Sītā is in a fix as to the language he should make use of for opening the coversation. He is averse to using the formal Sanskrit lest Sītā should take him for Rāvaṇa in disguise. So he decides (V-30-18.)

वाचं चोदाहरिष्यामि मानुषीमिह संस्कृताम् ॥

(V-30-17)

to make use of the colloquial Sanskrit. Thus, I am inclined to believe that the Vānaras too, like others used Prākṛt under ordinary circumstances and the formal Sanskrit under special ones. In addition to their being bookish some of these Vānaras were great travellers who had viewed things with their own eyes. We have already seen how Jāmbavān had tramped round the world full twenty-one times when the Devas joined hands with the Asuras to churn the sea in search of the Amṛta (IV-66-32-33). Vālin, it has been already alluded to above, used to visit the four seas daily for offering his Sandhyā prayers (VII-34-16-18). Again, for fear of losing his life in the hands of Vālin, Sugrīva toured round the four quarters of the globe, and the results of his experiences have been accorded a prominent place in the Rāmāyaṇa (IV-46-10-20). And the knowledge of the wide world he gained then, was utilised by him when he sent out search parties under various Vānara-chiefs to discover Sītā (IV-40-43).

Again, these Vānaras were past masters in the act of healing, and as such they were acquainted with the medicinal

properties of numerous herbs and roots. We are told that the Vānara messengers deputed by Hanūmān at the desire of Sugrīva, on their return journey visited the place where in by-gone days Mahādeva had celebrated a sacrifice on the Himālayas, and brought for their king fuits, roots and medicinal herbs that grew there (IV-37-27-32). Again, when Indra-jit had seriously wounded Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, Suṣeṇa proposed to send Sampāti, Panasa and others to the Candra and the Droṇa hills in the Kṣīroda sea to fetch the divine herbs, सञ्जीवकरणी and विशल्यां, that grew there (V1-50-30-31). Again, when Indrajit had wounded most of the Vānara chiefs along with Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa a second time, on that occasion we are told that Jāmba-vān sent Hanumān to fetch four medicinal herbs मृतसञ्जीवनी, विशल्य-करणी, सुवर्णकरणी and सन्धानी from the Oṣadhi hills in the Himālayan regions, that alone could restore the wounded Vānaras (V1-74-29-34). Again on the destruction of Indra-jit, Suṣeṇa, at the desire of Rāma, cured Lakṣmaṇa and other disabled Vānara soldiers of their wounds by applying efficacious remedies (VI-91-20-27). Once more when Rāvaṇa out of spite had wounded Lakṣmaṇa with his Śakti dart, Suṣeṇa directed Hanumān to go once more to the Oṣadhi hills and to get विशल्यकरणी, सावर्ण्यकरणी, सञ्जीव-करणी and सन्धानी for bringing round the younger Prince. (VI-101-29-32)

Mode of warfare——Vālmīki describes these Vānaras as

शिलाप्रहरणाः सर्वे सर्वे पर्वतयोधिनः ।
नखदंष्ट्रायुधाः सर्वे सर्वे सर्वास्त्रकोविदाः ॥

(1. 17. 25-26)

fighting with hills and stones, having nails and teeth for their weapons and knowing the use of all weapons. Else-where we are told that these Vānaras on reaching Laṅkā

ते तु वानरशार्दूलाः शार्दूला इव दंष्ट्रिणः ।
गृहीत्वा द्रुमशैलाग्रान् हृष्टा युद्धाय तस्थिरे ॥

(V1-47-45)

stood ready to give battle holding the ends of trees and stones ; and he goes on telling this fact *and nauseam.* Further on, Vālmīki tells us how they commenced the warfare when Rāma gave the word of command :—

"On the word of command having been given by Rāma, every individual Vānara raised a terrific yell impelled by a desire to make a rush. The Vānara chiefs thought of tearing open the town by striking it with huge hill-tops and reducing it to pieces with their blows. These uprooting numerous trees, both small and big, climbed on the ramparts of Laṅkā, in the very presence of Rāvaṇa. Thus those copper-faced and gold-coloured Vānaras, ready to die for Rāma, made a rush at the walls of Laṅkā, brandishing their weapons that consisted of the Śāl trees and stones. Then entering the town they began to demolish the ramparts and innumerable porches with huge stones and fists ; filled up the trench with dust, hill-tops, straw, and wood." (V1-42 10 18)

Thus Vālmīki wants us to believe that these Vānaras were deficient in the use of अस्त्रs or missiles that could be hurled at the enemy from a distance. When at close quarters, it is unnecessary for us to say, they took to wrestling. We know, for instance, that Vālin fought a wrestling duel with Dundubhi who had assumed the form of a buffalo. Ultimately we are told that having belaboured him mercilessly with his fists, thighs, feet, stones and trees, Vālin killed his antagonist by dashing him on the ground.

(IV-11-40-47)

Similarly the preliminary contest between Vālin and Sugrīva was fought mainly with a free exchange of slaps

and fists, till badly wounded, Sugrīva gave way and took to flight (IV-12-17-23). Again, in the final encounter, the contest began with boxing. Sugrīva, then, belaboured Vālin with a huge Sāl tree. Sugrīva next was worsted in a wrestling match, during which trees, stones, nails, kicks and slaps were freely exchanged. Meanwhile, Rāma finding Sugrīva driven to the wall, brought down his adversary with a deadly arrow—(IV-16-14-39).

But in this particular branch of fighting, viz. wrestling, the Vānaras, it seems, had attained great perfection. Vālmīki happening to give a detailed description of the wrestling contest between Rāvaṇa and Sugrīva, and the slights and tricks employed by each, really rouses our admiration. We are told that 'the contest began with free exchange of fists, slaps, kicks and striking with the elbows. Then there were throws and falls. Next, the one barred with the arm the onslaught of the other, followed by walking in circles in a guarded way. Then they advanced a few steps forward and then retreated in a zig-zag fashon. Lastly we are told how each took recourse to circular movements, hasty withdrawals, to make the enemy miss the aim, advancing steadily towards the enemy eying him all the time, withdrawals after defeats to a corner running towards the enemy, resting the arms on the thighs and doubling the body, striking the enemy at every pace, locking the arms on the breast and extending the arms to hold the arms of the enemy etc.' (VI-40-15-26). And need we say that our wrestlers make use of these very tricks till to-day ? The Vānaras also knew well the art of boxing and we are told how Aṅgada fought with a Rākṣasa general, Vajra-Daṇṣtra by name, a boxing contest.

But it seems that the Vānaras knew the use of arms as well and that they sometimes actually made use of these. In

the course of the description of these Vānaras, the poet along with others, uses the following terms, knowing the use of all weapons, like the nectar-consuming Devas (1-17-6) "knowing the use of all weapons' (1-17-26); Hanūmān pays a compliment to his fellow-Vānaras when he calls them कृतास्त्राः (V-59-8).

Besides, Lakṣmaṇa, while going to Kiṣkindhā to see Sugrīva, came across Vānara-guards liberally provided with arms, outside the town-limits (IV-31-19); again he saw that armed soldiers guarded the gates of Sugrīva's palace (IV-33-17).

Again, later on, we are told how the crown prince Aṅgada killed Vajra-Daṃṣṭra after fighting a duel with him with a shield and a broad-sword...(VI-54-30-14). Further on, we are told how in the course of a duel another Rākṣasa general, Virūpākṣa by name, cut off Sugrīva's armours (VI-96-26-27).

Amusements—Life is hardly worth living without a loud, lusty laugh! And though our poet does not tell us exactly how our heroes lost themselves in a loud laughter that taking away the cares and worries of this earth, transplanted them for the time being to the bowers of bliss where there reigns eternal beatitude and sweet forgetfulness, yet we are in a position to assert that the Vānaras had their own way of amusing themselves.

There is no doubt that they cultivated the art of music. During his lonely sojourn on the Prasravaṇa hills, Rāma used to listen to the sweet music of the Vānara minstrels, that came floating on the air from the neighbouring Kiṣkindhā (IV-27-27). Again, Lakṣmaṇa caught the strains of the Vānara music when he entered Sugrīva's harem, and this music, we are told, was scientific in its get-up as it agreed in keeping time and cadence, and rich in ornamentation (IV-33-21).

Again, it has already been alluded to above how steeped in wine and women Sugrīva, on his accession to the throne, managed to banish from his mind, temporarily at least, the world outside and its concerns. Mention has also been made above as to the way in which Aṅgada and his underlings notified their success in locating the whereabouts of Sītā to the dreadful court of Kiṣkindhā, (V-61-62).

Position of the she-vānaras—Says the great law-giver Manu

यत्र नार्यस्तु पूज्यन्ते रमन्ते तत्र देवताः ।
यत्रैतास्तु न पूज्यन्ते सर्वास्तत्राफलाः क्रियाः ॥ (III. 56)

The gods delight in dwelling at a place where the womenfolk are honoured, and where these are treated with scant respect there every thing goes wrong. Unfortunately Vālmīki introduces only two she-Vānaras in the course of his narrative. Of these we know Rumā—the wife of Sugrīva—only by name ; of the other viz. Tārā, we can say that we know something about her *in extenso.* And though aware of the danger of generalising things from a single instance, we could not check the temptation of rounding off the subject matter of this paper by a brief reference to this point.

Indeed, the high estimation in which Tārā was held by the Vānaras in general, and by Vālin and Sugrīva in particular, is simply bewildering, and the wonder of all wonders is this that the Aryan poet too shares this admiration for her along with her own people. Vālmīki is unstinted in lavishing suitable epithets to describe her character and attainments. He calls her ताराधिपातभानना (IV-16-1), having a face bright like the moon ; प्रियवादिनी दक्षिणा (IV-16-11) sweet-tongued, sincere; मन्त्रविद् (IV-16-12), well-versed in the Mantras ; सती (IV-19-7), a chaste lady ; रुचिरानना (IV-19-15),

having a beautiful face; चारुहासिनी (IV-19-17) sweet smiling; भामिनी (IV-20-2), wrathful; अनिन्द्यवर्णा (IV-20-26), having a colour that could not be talked lightly of; लोकश्रुता (IV-23-1), well-known in the world; चारुनेत्रा, कपिसिंहनाथा, अदीनसत्त्वा (IV-24-26), with beautiful eyes, consort of the lion of the Vānaras, high-spirited; आर्या (IV-24-29), an honourable lady; मनस्विनी (IV-24-30), intellectual, and सलक्षणा (IV-33-38), carrying auspicious marks. Vālin who knew her better speaks of her in the following terms:—सर्वज्ञा (IV-17-41), the omniscient; तपस्विनी (IV-18-55), leading a religious life.

Before expiring, he is said to have bestowed high compliments on her while taking leave of Sugrīva:

सुषेणदुहिता चेयमर्थसूक्ष्मविनिश्चये ।
औत्पातिके च विविधे सर्वतः परिनिष्ठिता ॥
यदेषा साध्विति ब्रूयात्कार्यं तन्मुक्तसंशयम् ।
नहि तारामतं किञ्चिदन्यथा परिवर्त्तते ॥
(IV-22-13—14.)

Tārā, the daughter of Suṣeṇa is well-accustomed to look into the springs of all actions; is well-versed in the science dealing with omens and is skilful in doing everything. Whatever action she approves of, let that be done without hesitation, for she seldom miscalculates. And the poor Vālin came to realise this fact at the cost of his life, for before he went out to give the battle to Sugrīva, Tārā had most solemnly advised him not to go (IV-15-6-30). Again, Hanūmān, while consoling Tārā on the death of Vālin, calls her a पण्डिता or a blue stocking (IV-21-5). Lakṣmaṇa too, sings in the same strain and calls her कार्यतत्त्वज्ञा (IV-33-49), knowing well, the springs of actions. Aṅgada also uses the following respectful terms to describe her:

प्रकृत्या प्रियपुत्रा सा सानुक्रोशा तपस्विनी ॥ (IV-55-15)

Naturally of a loving disposition, fond of child and devoted to religious pursuits. Such then was the high regard in which Tārā was held in olden times, and we may not be accused of committing a grave error when we say that the Vānaras, under ordinary circumstances, treated their womenfolk with respect.

And this Tārā, before Vālin died, was most solemnly committed to the care of Rāma in these words :

मद्दोषकृतदोषां तां यथा तारां तपस्विनीम् ।
सुग्रीवो नावमन्येत तथावस्थातुमर्हसि ॥ (IV-18-55)

Be good enough to acquit yourself in such a way that Sugrīva might not dishonour her—the pious lady who has been reduced to this pitiable state through my fault !

And how honorably kept !

Conclusion—Such were the Vānaras of old and such was their civilisation. Thus giving a direct lie to the testimony of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa,

ततोऽर्थकामाभिनिवेशितात्मनां शुनां कपीनामिव (I-18-45.)

that the Vānaras even like the dogs are devoted exclusively to Artha and Kāma, we actually find that Dharma too equally engaged their attention, and this was the *summum bonum* of life aimed at by the Aryans of old.

Now the last question that awaits solution in this connection, is—who were these Vānaras of old ? There are people who are pleased to call these non-Aryans. I remember to have seen the abstract of a paper, published in the Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference held at Madras in this connection. In it the learned writer tried to identify the Vānaras of old with certain aboriginal tribes inhabiting the central parts of C. P. I do not want to pick up a quarrel with the above-mentioned scholar, but I would only like to

invite his attention to the fact that Vālmīki never intended that his creations should be misconstrued in this way. I am sure that he directly or indirectly, never calls the Vānaras non-Aryans. Only once I remember the wrathful Lakṣmaṇa uses the word अनार्य with reference to Sugrīva and there the sense is clear. When he says to the Vānara king

अनार्यस्त्वं कृतघ्नश्च मिथ्यावादी च वानर ।
पूर्वं कृतार्थो रामस्य न तत्प्रतिकरोषि यत् ॥ (IV-34-13)

he means to abuse him and अनार्य here does not mean a non-Aryan, but rude or uncivil. Again if you call a spade a spade, it will not be taken as an abuse, and if we perforce apply the sense of non-Aryan here, then it must be understood that Lakṣmaṇa was conscious of the fact that he was abusing an Ārya by using the term अनार्य. On the contrary Vālmīki more than once uses the term आर्य with reference to these Vānaras. It is certainly not a euphemism when the poet calls Tārā आर्या (V-24-29), and when Tārā calls Vālin आर्यपुत्र (IV-19 27). Again, these Vānaras were neither अनग्नि, nor अब्रह्मा, nor अनृचः nor अनिन्द्र (see Iyengar's "Life in the Age of the Mantras"). And if the difference between the Āryas of the Vedic age and the non Aryan Dasyus was not one of race, but of cult alone, then how are we to call these Fire-worshipping, and Indra-and Brahma-worshipping, Vānaras, non-Āryans ? Under these circumstances I am strongly in favour of suspecting that these Vānaras were the Vrātyas of the first migration, who had taken to the fresh fields and pastures new of the Deccan on the advent of the Āryans of the second migration, and that they had already been reclaimed before Rāma in the course of his wanderings visited their habitat. But when all has been said about the Vānaras, the fact remains that their tail could not be reconciled with sober history, and here I plead my inability.

IV—A COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS OF THE ṚGVEDA-, VÂJASANEYI-,

TAITTIRĪYA—, AND ATHARVAVEDA-(CĀTURADHYĀYIKĀ) PRÂTIŚĀKHYAS

By Mangal Deva Shastri.

It is recognised that the study of the different Prātiśākhyas is indispensable not only to the textual criticism of the different Vedic Saṁhitās but also to the interpretation of many a doubtful form in their texts. Their importance to the student of the history of Vedic Grammar which is represented in Sanskrit literature only by a few more or less scientific treatises cannot be exaggerated. Similar is the case if we look at them from the point of view of the history of Indo-Aryan sounds or Indian phonetics. At least one of them also affords a good deal of material for the study of Vedic metre. It is strange that the study of this important branch of Sanskrit literature, which as its name implies used to be an essential feature of the courses of study prevalent, in olden days, in the different branches or *Śākhās* of the learned community in India, has for a long time been neglected, so much so that even such great writers as Sāyaṇa and others do not show much familiarity with these works in their Vedic commentaries. This accounts for the unsatisfactory state, in many places, of their texts and commentaries. It is a matter of great satisfaction, however, that these works so long involved in darkness and obscurity are again seeing the light of the day through the labours of modern scholarship.

It is clear that comparative study, in detail, of the works in question is an essential preliminary for our being able to arrive at some definite results with regard to the

different studies or sciences related to them. Though it is true that a great bulk of these works is concerned only with a particular Vedic Saṁhitā, the scientific theories underlying all their treatment are generally the same or at least similar. The standard of development of the different studies represented in them is also, generally speaking, the same. It being so, it is not impossible to draw, from their comparative study, *general* results which may throw a good deal of light on the scientific and historical study of the different sciences referred to above. In view of these facts a detailed and exhaustive comparison of the contents of the different Prātiśākhyas, given below, is bound to be of interest to the students of Vedic philology. The general results which can be drawn on the basis of this study will be dealt with in due course in subsequent sections. It must be admitted that something in this direction has been already accomplished by Prof. Whitney in his learned and scholarly editions of the Taittirīya-and Atharva-Prātiśākhyas and to a less extent also by Prof. Weber in his Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya. But apart from this material fact that their treatment of this matter is not exhaustive, their comparisons, dispersed as they are throughout the whole books, also cannot be readily used and properly studied.

A few words about the texts used and the references given below are also necessary here. For the Ṛg. Prāt., of course, I have followed my usual method of referring to a Paṭala and to the number of the Sūtra in that Paṭala, and that, too, according to my own edition of the work, which, I hope, will be, before long, in the hands of the public. As for the Vāj. Prāt., unfortunately, owing to their unsatisfactory nature, I could not strictly follow any one of the published texts. The cases where, with regard to reference, I have deviated from Prof. Weber's edition are as follows. In Ch. III my references do not correspond to his numbering

of the Sūtras, as I refer to his Sūtras, 1 (a) and 1 as 1 and 2 respectively and as the Sūtra (ससाद् च) 60, according to my reference, is not counted at all by Weber. So is the case with Ch. IV. Weber includes Sūtras 52 and 53 in one Sūtra (52). He numbers Sūtras 58 and 59 as 57 and 57 (a) respectively. An additional Sūtra (115 : न द्विरुक्तम्) is wrongly inserted by him in the text. I may further add that I have referred to Weber's I. 39 and I. 40 respectively as I. 40 and I. 39. In other cases, of course, I have throughout followed Prof. Weber. The references to the Tait. Prāt. and Ath. Prāt. are according to the editions of Prof. Whitney.

As will appear from a careful study of the following comparison, my interpretation of some Sūtras (e. g. Tait. Prāt. XI. 19) is different from that of Prof. Whitney and others. In the interest of brevity I have omitted to point out such differences in the following pages.

The order of various topics given under different heads cannot be said to be strictly scientific in all respects. On the whole they are arranged according to their subject matter, but in some cases, especially when the matter is not common even to any two Prātiśākhyas, each Prātiśākhya is taken and dealt with separately in the order which is adopted for it in the following table.

I. INTRODUCTORY AND EXPLANATORY.

I. Introductory matter :

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Obeisance to the deity	Intro. stanza 1	...	....	....
Nature of the intended work ...	,, ,,	...	....	....
A mystic description of the three kinds of Vedic texts, i. e. Saṁhitā, Pada and Krama ...	Intro. stanzas 2—4	...	....	....
Requirements of a Vedic Scholar	Intro. stanzas 5,6,8	...	XXIV. 5,6	....
Scope of the treatise ...	Intro. stanzas 5—7	I. 1—4	....	I. 1, 2
Relation of the treatise to the general grammar ...	...	...	...	I. 2
Enumeration of alphabetic sounds	Intro. stanzas 9, 10	VIII. 1—30, 43—46, I. 34	....	...

2. *Definition of Terms* :

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
समानाक्षर	I. 1	...	I. 2	Not defined, but used
सन्ध्यक्षर ...	I. 2	I45, VIII. 8-12	....	do.
स्वर ...	I. 3	VIII. 2-13	I. 5	do.
व्यञ्जन	I. 6	I. 47, VIII. 14-29	I. 6	do.
स्पर्श ...	I. 7	VIII. 15-20	I. 7	do.
अन्तःस्था ...	I. 9	VIII. 21	I. 8	do.
ऊष्मन् ...	I. 10	VIII. 22	I. 9	do.
अघोष	I. 11,12	....	I. 12, 13	do.
सोष्मन्	I. 13	I. 54	...	I. 10
अनुनासिक	I. 14 (also cp. I.36, XIII. 20	I. 89 (also cp. I. 75)	II. 30	I. 11

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
ह्रस्व	I. 17	I. 55	I. 31-34	I. 59
दीर्घ	I. 18	I. 57	I. 35	I. 61
अक्षर (=a syllable) ...	I. 19, XVIII. 32	I.99, VIII. 48, 49	Used, but not defined	I. 93
गुरु	I. 20, 21, XVIII. 37, 41	....	XXII. 14	I. 52-54
गरीयस्	XVIII.42	....	....	....
लघु	XVIII. 38, 39, 43	...	XXII.14, 15	I. 51
लघीयस्	XVIII. 44	...	....	....
रक्त (=a nasal sound) ...	I. 36	....	....	....
संयोग	I. 37, XVIII. 40	I. 48	Used, but not defined	I. 98
नासिक्य	I. 48	Cp. I. 74, VIII. 28	Cp. I. 18, II. 49, XXI. 12-14	Cp. I. 26, 100
स्थान (=places of production of sounds) ...	I. 49	I. 62	II. 31, 33	Used, but not defined

नामिन्	I. 65	....	....	do.
प्रगृह्य	I.68—75	I.92–98	...	I.73—81
रेफिन् or रिफित ...	I.76–103	I.160-168	..	...
संहिता ...	II.2	I.158	Cp. V. 1, XXIV. 1-4	Used, but not defined
विवृत्ति ...	II.3	Used, but not defined, cp. I.119	Used, but not defined, cp. XX. 6, XXII. 13	Used, but not defined, cp. III.63
द्विषंधि ...	II.80	...	...	....
ध्रुव	VI.39–42	...	...	....
प्लुति (=lengthening of a short vowel) ...	VII.2–4	...	..	....
क्रम (=the Krama text) ...	X.1,2, XI.1	IV.181	Used, but not defined, cp. XXIV. 6	IV.110, 111
उपस्थित ...	X.12, XI. 29	Used, but not defined, cp. IV.88	...	....

11

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
स्थित or स्थिति ...	X.13, XI. 28	...	Not defined, but used, cp. XX. 2	....
स्थितोपस्थित ...	X.14, XI. 30	I.147	...	....
श्वास ...	XIII.1	....	II.5	Cp.I.12
नाद ...	XIII.1	....	II.4	Cp.I.13
करण (=producing organ or mode of articulation) ...	XIII.8	Cp.I.11, 43,90	II.32,34	Cp.I.18
समापाद्य ...	XIII.31	....	....	Cp.IV.73, 74,117
दोष ...	XIV.1	Not defined, but used, cp. IV.162.	....	....
प्रश्न ...	XV. 23—30, XVIII. 58	....	...	....
अध्याय	XV.31, XVIII 58	....	....	....

उपधा (=a sound preceding a final sound) ...	Used in a more general sense, but not defined, cp. II.41, IV.29	I.35	....	.9I
नति (=cerebralization) ...	V.61	I.42	....	...
सवर्ण ...	Used, but not defined, cp. I.55	I.43	Cp. I.3,4	Used, but not defined, cp. III. 42
सिम् (=समानाक्षर) ...	....	I.44	...	...
भाविन् (=नामिन्) ...	....	I.46	...	...
जित् (=खर् of Pāṇini) ...	...	I.50,51	...	...
मुद् (=शर् of Pāṇini) ...	...	I.52	...	...
धि (=घोषवत्; or हश् of Pāṇini)...	...	I.53	...	...
मात्रा ...	Cp. I.27	I.56	Used, but not defined, Cp. XXIV.6	Used, but not defined

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
प्लुत (=a trimoric prolated vowel)...	I.30; also=a दीर्घ vowel, cp. VII. 33 etc.	I.58	I.36	I.62
अणु	...	I.60	Not defined, but cp. XIX.3	Not defined, but cp.III. 65
परमाणु ...	...	I.61	...	...
लोप	Used, but not defined	I. 141	I. 57	Not defined, but used, cp. I. 67
आम्रेडित	....	I. 146	...	Not defined, but used, cp. IV. 40
अपृक्त	Used, but not defined, cp. I.75	I. 151	I. 54	Not defined, but used, cp. I. 72
संहित	Used, but not defined	I. 155	...	...
असंहित	do.	I. 156	...	...
अयोगवाह ...	...	VIII. 23—27	...	...
जिह्वामूलीय	Cp.intro.stanza 10 and I. 41	VIII. 25	Not defined, but used	Used for all sounds formed at जिह्वामूल, cp. I. 20.

उपध्मानीय	Cp.intro.stanza 10	VIII. 26	do.	...
अनुस्वार	Cp.intro.stanza 10 and I. 24	VIII. 27	do.	...
विसर्जनीय	do.	VIII. 24	do.	Not defined, but used
यम	Cp. I. 50	VIII. 29	Cp. XXI. 13	do.
पद ...	Used, but not defined	VIII. 50,51	Not defined, but used	do.
वर्ग (=classes of mutes) ...	Cp. I. 8	Not defined, but used, Cp. I. 49	I. 10	Not defined, but used
प्रथम ...	Not defined, but used		I. 11	do.
द्वितीय ...	do.	do.	do.	do.
तृतीय ...	do.	do.	do.	do.
चतुर्थ ...	do.	do.	do.	do.
उत्तम (also **पञ्चम** in Vāj. Prāt) ...	do.	do.	do.	do.
घोषवत् ..	do.	...	I. 14	do.

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
अवग्रह ...	do.	Not defined, but used	I. 49	do.
प्रग्रह (=प्रगृह्य) ..	...	...	IV. 1—54	...
विक्रम (=a kind of अनुदात्त accent)	...	...	XIX. 1,2	...
पद्य (=a पदान्त्य sound) ...	...	...	...	I. 3
अभिनिष्ठान (=विसर्जनीय) ...	...	...	...	I. 42
अभिनिधान (=holding apart of a consonant and suppression of its sound) ...	Cp. VI. 17	...	Used in a different sense, cp. XIV. 9—11	I. 43
आस्थापित (=अभिनिधान) ...	Used in another sense, cp. IV. 1	...	...	I. 48
संयुक्त (=Combination of consonants not accompanied with अभिनिधान) ...	Used in the ordinary sense, but cp. VI. 24	...	Used in a different sense, cp. XXII. 15	I. 49, 50
कर्षण ...	...	....	....	II. 39

विकम्पित ...	Not defined, but cp. III. 34	...	...	III. 65
समापत्ति (= restoration in the Pada and Krama texts) ...	Not used, but cp. XIII. 31	...	....	IV. 73
परिहार ...	...	...	...	IV. 117
आस्थापित (= संहितावद्वचनम्, cp. Ath. Prāt.) ...	Used in another sense, cp. IV. I	...	....	IV. 125

3. *Interpretation and application of rules :*

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
इति added to a sound in representing it ...	..	I. 36	...	...
Use of—कार in the name of a sound ...	...	I. 37	I.16,cp. XXII. 4	...
Use of—वर्ण in the name of a sound	...	...	XXII. 4, cp. I. 20	...
But अ+कार to be added in the case of consonants	...	I. 38	I. 17	...
An—अ (also) forms the names of consonants	...	....	I. 21	...
Vowels also form the names of consonants ...	...	I. 40	...	...
—कार is not used in the case of Visarjanīya, etc. ...	...	I. 41	I. 18	...

12

एफ added to *r* (instead of—कार)	....	I. 39	I. 19	...
—वर्ण added to a short vowel signifies the three vowels	...	...	I.20, cp.XXII. 4	....
—वर्ग added to a first mute signifies the series ...	....	Cp. I. 64	I. 27	...
A short vowel implies both short and long vowels (in certain cases) ...	Cp. I. 55	Cp. I. 63	...	...
A and *ā* to be treated as homogeneous vowels[1] ...	...	I. 72	...	...
Numbers are used with reference to the mutes alone ...	...	I. 49	...	...
Significance of the terms-वर्ण, -कार, च, अपि, तु, अथ, एव, वा and न used in the treatise	...	...	XXII. 3—8	...

1 Cp. Pāṇini, VIII. 4,68.

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Continued implication is of that which was last ...	...	...	I. 58	...
A cited theme ending in *a* (or any other vowel) includes all its cases or other derivative forms ...	...	...	I. 22	...
In case of doubt as to which occurrence of a cited word is intended the next word or part of a word is cited along with it ...	...	...	I. 25	...
Or the citation is made of more than one word (in the same case) ...	...	...	I. 26	...
Whatever word is qualified as 'preceding' another word, that word is to be understood in that cituation alone ...	...	...	I. 29	...

Whatever word is qualified as 'following' another word, that word is to be taken in that citation alone ...	...	...	I. 30	...
An उपबन्ध (addition, to the word at which the rule aims, of an *extra* word or words from the same Vedic passage) is with a view to restrict the application of the rule to that particular passage, the rule having its effect constantly[1] ...	...	...	I. 59	...
A Pragṛhya word or one containing Anusvāra, though defined by means of its surroundings, retains its character even when separated from them ...	...	...	I. 60	...

1 Cp. the Comm. by Gārgya Gopāla.

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
A passage of three or more words, if repeated, is as already established ...	...	...	I. 61	....
In citation of a word, that word itself (and not a part of a word identical in form with it) is to be understood, even when phonetically altered, or preceded by *a-* or *an-* ...	...	...	I. 50—53	....
Unless otherwise stated, parts of compounds treated as words with certain exceptions ...	I. 61, 62	Cp. I. 153,154	I. 48	...
A Praiṣa treated like a Pāda ...	I. 57	...	...	...
The sound to be changed put in the nominative ...	I. 56	....	Cp. I. 23	...

Or a word, affected by the change, may be cited without any case ...	...	..	I. 24	...
The resulting sound put in the accusative	I. 56	I. 133	I. 28	
If a term is used in the locative, the change affects that which (immediately) precedes[1] ...	...	I. 134	...	...
If a term is used in the ablative, the change affects the initial sound of that which follows[2] ...	..	I. 135	...	...
The genitive case is to be interpreted as meaning 'in the place of'[3] ...	...	I. 136	...	...

1. Cp. Pāṇini, I. 1, 66. 2. Cp. Pāṇini, I. 1, 67 and 54. 3. Cp. Pāṇini, I. 1, 49.

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
An increment is designated by the instrumental case	...	I. 137	Cp. I. 23	...
An increment takes place between two words ...	...	I. 138	...	....
In case of a single word, however, the increment is made after it ...	...	I. 139	....	....
An alteration may affect both initials and finals of words or only a single sound	...	I. 140	...	...
Alteration and omission are of a single sound, not of a whole word[1]	Cp. II. 5	...	I. 56	....
The conversion is to be made according to proximity[2] ...	I. 56	Cp. I. 142	....	I. 95

1. Cp. Pāṇini, I. 1, 52 and 54.　　2. Cp. Pāṇini, I. 1, 50.

A subsequent mention of words or sounds which are equal in number to those already mentioned is to be taken in the order of their enumeration[1] ...	....	I. 143	..	....
In case of doubt as to which of the neighbouring and distant words is meant, the reference should be understood to the neighbouring one	...	I. 144	...	...
When both the preceding and following words come under the influence of two rules at the same time the following one is affected (?)	Cp. V 2. (?)	I. 145	....	...

1. Cp. Pāṇini, I. 3, 10.

	Ath. Prāt.	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.
In case of opposition of two rules the latter is regarded as more powerful excepting in the case of omission[1]	...	I. 159	...	...
Exceptions to be understood as connected with the general rules	I. 53	...	...	...
Irregular formations to be taken with reference to the whole treatise ...	I. 54	...	....	...
The Sāma-vaśa Sandhis to be regarded as exceptions	I. 60	....	...	....
Euphonic modification affects only those initials and finals of words which are seen in the Pada text[2]	II. 5	III. 3, also cp. 4, 5, IV. 117	Cp. X. 25, I. 56	Cp. III. 35,37

1. Cp. Pāṇini, I. 4, 2.

2. Cp. पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्, Pāṇini, VIII. 2, 1.

But in certain definite cases a rule may affect even those sounds which are the result of euphonic combination or which occur in the interior of words	Cp. VI. 16	Cp. IV. 99 etc.	Cp. XIII. 5	Cp. I. 99 ect.
Finals of words joined to इति (in the Pada text) to be taken as they appear without that इति, and of words not joined to इति to be taken just as they are ...	I. 58, 59	....	...	...
A word consisting of only one letter (even if contracted) treated as final and as initial[1] ...	II. 6	Cp. I. 152	Cp. I. 55	...
An unrhotacised Visarjaniya with its penultimate treated as one letter in certain cases ...	I. 67	...	....	...

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Euphonic combination takes place according to succession of words ...	II. 7	...	Cp. V. 3	Cp. III.38
But the cerebralization of a following initial precedes sibilation of a final Visarjaniya	V. 2	...	...	....
In cerebralization the cause of cerebralization precedes and the object of the same follows ...	I. 66	...	....	...
A Pluta vowel, followed by *i*, treated like a long vowel ...	I. 4	...	...	...

1. Cp, आद्यन्तवदेकस्मिन्, Pāṇini, I, 1, 21.

II. PHONETIC.

1. *Classification of alphabetic sounds* :—

	Ṛg. Prāt,	Vaj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Monophthongs ...	I. 1, cp. I. 31.	Cp I. 44 (and VIII. 3-6)	I. 2	Cp. III. 42
ṛ (*-varṇa*) ...	Do.	Do.	Cp I.31, II.18	Cp. I. 37,38, III. 42
ḷ (*-varṇa*)	XIII. 35.	Cp. I. 87, IV. 146, VIII. 7,46	Do.	Cp. I. 39
Diphthongs	I. 2	I. 45, VIII. 8–12	Cp. II. 13–17, 23, 26–29	Cp. I. 40
Vowels ...	I. 3	VIII. 2–13, 43,46	I. 5	...
Short and long vowels ...	I. 17,18	Cp. I. 55, 57	Cp. I. 3, 31–33,35	Cp. I. 59,61
Pluta or prolated vowels ...	Cp. I. 30,31	Cp. I. 58	Cp. I. 36	Cp. I. 62
Anusvāra is either a consonant or a vowel ...	I. 5	Cp. VIII.27	Cp. Whitney on II. 30	Cp. Whitney on I. 11

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt	Ath. Prāt.
Consonants ...	I. 6	I. 47, VIII. 14–29,44,45	I. 6	....
Mutes or Contact Consonants ...	I. 7	VIII. 15–20	I. 7	...
Five classes of mutes ...	I. 8	VIII. 15-20, also cp. I. 49	I. 10, 11	...
Semi-vowels	I. 9	VIII. 21	I. 8	...
Breathings (=ऊष्माणः) ...	I. 10	VIII. 22	I. 9	...
Surd consonants	I. 11,12	...	I. 12, 13	Cp. I. 12
Sonant consonants ...	Cp. Uvaṭa on I. 12	...	I. 14	Cp. I. 13
Aspirates ...	I. 13	I. 54	...	I. 10
consonants	I. 14	I. 89	Cp. II. 30	I. 11
अयोगवाहाः ...	...	VIII. 23-27	...	...

2. *Mode of formation of alphabetic sounds :*

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Psychical factor in the production of articulate sounds	XIII. 13	....	Cp. II. 2	...
Physical factors in the production of articulate sounds ...	Do.	I. 5–15	XXII. 1, 2, XXIII. 1—3	...
Eternity of alphabetic sounds according to some	XIII. 14	....	....	...
General mode of production of articulate sounds ...	XIII. 1–3	Cp. I. 5–15	II. 1—7	....
Description of voice, breath and voice-breath ...	Do.	Cp. I. 11	II. 4—7	...
Distinction of surd, sonant and surd-sonant sounds ...	XIII. 4–7	....	II. 8—11	Cp. I. 12,13
Nature of voice in sonant sounds	XIII. 15,18	...	...	...

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Nature of aspiration in aspirate sounds ...	XIII. 16-19	...	Cp. II. 11	...
Different degrees of approximation of the organs in the utterance of different sounds ...	XIII. 8–12	Cp. I. 72	Cp. II. 12—27, 31—34,44,45	I. 29—36
Places of production (of articulate sounds) in general ...	...	I. 10, 30	II. 3	...
Classification of sounds according to their place (=स्थान) of production ..	I. 38–51	I. 62-71, 73–75, 89	...	....
Special rules for the production of alphabetic sounds with reference to their particular places and organs (=करण) of production	...	Cp. I. 75—84	II. 12—30, 35—52	Cp. I. 18—28

Definition of स्थान and करण in the case of vowels and consonants respectively ...	...	...	II. 31—34	....
Production of a nasalized sound	XIII. 20	I. 75	II. 52	I. 27
Nature of Anusvāra according to Vyāḍi ...	XIII. 37	...	Cp. II. 30	...
Mode of right pronunciation of vowels *in general* ...	XIV. 65,66	...	...	...
Nature of *ṛ-varṇa* and *ḷ-varṇa* ...	XIII. 34,35	IV. 146	Cp. Whitney on II. 18	I. 37—39
The mode of nasalization of *ṛ-varṇa* ...	...	...	...	I. 71
Nature of diphthongs ...	XIII. 38—41	Cp. I. 73, IV. 143	II. 13—17,23, 26—29	I. 40, 41
Right pronunciation of consonants *in general* ...	XIV. 67	...	...	...

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prot.	Taitt. Prat.	Ath. Prat.
Nature of ḷ (ळ्) and ḷh (ळ्ह) sounds ...	I. 52	Cp. IV. 144, VIII. 45	Cp. Whitney on XIII. 16	...
Opinions of various authorities as to the degree of nasality in different nasal sounds	...	...	XVII. 1—4	...
General mode of correct utterance	...	...	XVII. 7, 8, XXIII. 20	....

3. *Quantity* :

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Quantity of short, long and prolated vowels ...	I. 27, 29, 30	I. 55—58	I. 31–33,35,36	I. 59, 61, 62
Quantity of a nasalized vowel according to Old Kauṇḍinya ...	...	...	XVII. 5, cp. Gārgya Gopāla	Cp. I. 53
Quantity of consonants ...	I. 34	I. 59	I. 37	I. 60
" " Anusvāra preceded by a short or long vowel ...	XIII. 32, 33	IV. 148, 149	Cp. I. 34	...
" " syllables (heavy and light) ...	I. 20, 21, XVIII. 37-39, 41, 43	Cp. IV. 107	XXII. 14, 15	I. 51—54
" " syllables (heavier and lighter) ...	XVIII. 42, 44	...	....	...
" " Avagraha	I. 28	V. I	XXII. 13	....

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Quantity of Svara-bhakti ...	I. 33, 35	Cp. IV. 16, 146, 147	Cp. XXI. 15	I. 101, 102
,, ,, स्फोटन	...	....	....	I. 103
Duration of voice called ध्रुव which follows a sonant अभिनिधान ...	VI. 39	...	...	...
Duration of breath and voice	XIII. 7	...	...	...
,, ,, hiatus	II.4	....	XXII. 13	...
Length of different kinds of pauses ...	...	....	XXII. 13	...
Quantity of Om ...	XV. 5	II. 51	XVIII. 1	...
Different quantities of substituted sounds ...	...	IV. 147	...	....
Nature of sounds having one, two, or three moras illustrated...	XIII. 50	...	...	....

4. *Accent*:

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
General character of acute, grave and circumflex accents	III. I, 2, 3	I. 31, 32, 108—110	I. 38—40	I. 14—16
A consonant shares the accent of its vowel ...	Cp. III. 2	I. 107	Cp. I. 43	...
Mode of production of acute and grave accents ...	Cp. III. 1	Cp. I. 31	XXII. 9, 10	...
Details respecting the utterance of circumflex ...	III. 4—6	I. 126	I. 41—47	I. 17
Nature of enclitic circumflex ...	III. 7	Cp. IV. 135	Cp. XIV. 29	Cp. III. 67,68
,, ,, natural or constant (जात्य, Tait. Prāt. नित्य) circumflex ...	III. 8	I. 111	XX. 2	III. 57
Acute resulting from coalescence of two vowels ...	III. 11, 16	IV. 129,130, 132	X. 10, XII.10, 11	III. 66

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Circumflex as the result of combination of two syllables into one ...	III. 12—14	IV. 47, 61, 62, 129-131, 133, 134	X. 12,16,17, XII. 9	III. 55, 56, 58—61
Circumflex instead of a grave following an acute ...	III. 17	IV. 135—137	XIV. 29—33	III. 62, 63, 67—70,
Names[1] (and nature) of different kinds of circumflex (enclitic or independent) resulting from euphonic combination of syllables ...	III. 18	I. 112—120	XX. 1, 3—8	III. 55, 56, 58—63
कम्पन or depression in four kinds of circumflex ...	III. 34	IV. 138	XIX. 3—5	III. 65

1. The different Prātiśākhyas differ as to the number and order of the names as follows :—

Ṛg. Prāt :—वृत्त, तैरोव्यञ्जन, क्षैप्र, अभिनिहित and प्रश्लिष्ट ;
Vāj. Prāt :—अभिनिहित, क्षैप्र, प्रश्लिष्ट, तैरोव्यञ्जन, तैरोविराम, पादवृत्त, and ताथाभाव्य, (? cp, Uvaṭa);
Tait. Prāt :—क्षैप्र, प्रातिहत, अभिनिहत, प्रश्लिष्ट, पादवृत्त and तैरोव्यञ्जन ;
Ath. Prāt :—अभिनिहित, प्राश्लिष्ट, क्षैप्र, तैरोव्यञ्जन and पादवृत्त.

Different degrees of force in the utterance of different kinds of circumflex ...	...	Cp. I. 125	XX. 9—12	Cp. Whitney, pp. 484,485
Nature of effort required by circumflex in general ...	...	...	XVII. 6	...
विक्रम (=a grave accent in certain positions) defined ...	...	...	XIX. 1,2	....
Nature of effort required by a विक्रम accent ...	...	....	XVII. 6	....
प्रचय accent ...	III.9,10,19-23, 27, 28	IV. 139—141	XXI. 10,11	III. 71—74
Treatment of Avagraha in accentuation ...	III. 24—26	I. 148—150, cp. also IV. 137	...	III. 64,69,73
Accent of a prolated vowel, or एकश्रुतिस्वर of all the words according to some (?) ...	Cp. XV. 16	Cp. I. 130,131	XV. 9 (Cp. Whitney and G. Gopāla)	....
Accent in recitation in general ...	XV. 16	Cp. I. 130,131	Cp. XV. 9	....

	Ṛg. Prāt,	Vaj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Different opinions as to the accents allowed in recitation	....	I. 127—132	...	...
Defects in the utterance of accents ...	III. 29—33	..	...	...
Movements of the hand indicating differences of accentuation of words in recitation ...	...	I. 121—125	...	...
Accent of Om ...	XV. 5	II. 51	XVIII. 2, 3, 5—7	...
„ „ the Upasargas ...	XII. 22—24	Cp. VI. 24	...	...
Enumeration of unaccented words in the beginning of a Pāda in the Ṛgveda ...	XVII. 27—35	..	...	...
Unaccented Pādas in the Ṛgveda	XVII. 36	...	...	....
A special case of accent ...	...	...	...	I. 96

Paribhāṣās regarding accentuation of words : Every word excepting that which has a circumflex has an acute [1]	...	...	II. 1	...	....
The rest of it is grave[1]	....	...	II. 2	....	...
सर्वानुदात्त words	...	....	II.3—18, 52, 53,63	...	...
Exceptions	....	...	II. 19—21	...	....
आद्युदात्त words	...	...	II.22—45,64	...	...
द्व्युदात्त words	....	...	II. 46—48	...	...
त्र्युदात्त words	....	...	II. 49	...	...
सर्वोदात्त words	...	....	II. 50, 51	....	...
अन्तोदात्त words	...	...	II.54—62,64	...	...

1. Cp. Pāṇini, VI, 1, 158,

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt	Ath. Prāt.
Accentuation of verbal forms ...	...	VI.1, 11—23	...	....
„ „ Upasargas (in a compound or sentence) ...	...	VI.2—10.24	...	....

5. *Syllabication* :

		Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
15	Division of syllables	I.22—26,32, XVIII.32–36	I. 99—106	XXI. 1—9	I. 55—58, 104

6. *Qualities, tones and modes of utterance :*

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
The three *sthānas* [1] or qualities of utterance ...	XIII. 42	Cp. I. 10,30	XXII.11, cp. XXIII.5, 10	....
The seven *sthānas* [2] or qualities of utterance	...	...	XXIII.4—10	...
The seven tones or notes (=*yamas*) ...	XIII.42—45	Cp. I. 127	XXII. 12, XXIII.11-19[3]	....
The three modes (=*vṛttis*)[4] of speech	XIII.46—49	....	...	...
The quality of Om ...	Cp. XV. 5	...	XVIII. 4	....

1 मन्द्र, मध्यम, उत्तम (or तार)।

2 उपांशु, ध्वान, निमद; उपब्दिमत्, मन्द्र, मध्यम, तार।

3 क्रुष्ट (or कुष्ट), प्रथम, द्वितीय, तृतीय, चतुर्थ, मन्द्र, अतिस्वार्य। Cp. also Uvaṭa on Ṛg. Prāt XIII,44 & Vāj,Prāt,I,127,

4 विलम्बिता, मध्यमा, द्रुता।

(To be continued).

V.—DOCTRINE OF FORMAL TRAINING AND THE ANCIENT INDIAN THOUGHT.

By G. L. Sinha.

The history of education in the west is characterised by a continuous succession of beliefs, ideals and methods which manifested themselves in thoughts and practices from time to time and which were the exhibition of the effort of men to obtain a truer conception of the meaning, nature and purpose of education that would lift them above the narrow prejudices, the narrow outlook and the petty trials of life and afford them an opportunity to enjoy the utmost development of their powers, to appreciate fully what nature had brought together around them, to achieve the very best of themselves and to participate in the best of the life of others. There was the Humanistic Education which posited that the study of the literature of the ancients comprised the whole of education. The aim of education, therefore, was thought of in terms of language and literature of the ancient Greeks and Romans instead of actual life, and the educational effort was directed towards the mastery of these. At its best it gave little thought to broader preparation for life and made no room for the study of Nature or of society, and, at first, little for even mathematics,—a study which later on conquered a definite place in their scheme. Schoolwork degenerated into the teaching of language and literature, and grammar was given extreme importance for the fact that it was considered the basis and the foundation of all language study ; and the child was expected to memorise at the very outset a number of rules and facts which he could do only after much labour and continued application.

Then followed the Humanistic Realism. This was an attempt to lay emphasis upon the study of Nature, of man and of social institutions. But the upholders of this view believed that this could be done best only through the study of the life, writings and investigations of the ancients. The Realistic Humanists gave much wider significance to the narrow conception of education of the pure Humanists; but they, nevertheless, maintained much of the old in as much as they held that nothing nobler and greater or higher than what the ancients had accomplished was possible. Thus 'if military science was to be studied, it could in no place be better searched for than in Caesar and in Xenophon; was agriculture to be practised, no better guide was to be found than Virgil or Columella; was architecture to be mastered, no better way existed than through Vitruvius; was geography to be considered, it must be through Mela or Solinus; was medicine to be understood no better means than Celous existed; was natural history to be appreciated, there was no more adequate source of information than Pliny and Seneca.'*

The subsequent period was a period of extreme change which began initially under the Reformation. With the spread of Sense Realism we get for the first time the formulation of a general theory of education based upon rational rather than upon empirical ground. The old practice of counting one's educational advancement in terms of 'memory activities' was completely overthrown and was supplanted by a new conception which was derived from the fundamental belief that knowledge comes primarily through the senses, that education is consequently founded on a training in sense perception and not in memorising facts of books

* Monroe : A text book in the History of Education, page 444.

or repeating the words of the teacher. This gave rise to two very important tendencies which may well be said to be the 'seeds' of almost all that we have to say regarding our present science of pedagogy. One set the educators of that period to work out a science or philosophy of education, although of a very rudimentary nature in the beginning; and the other brought about a complete overthrow of the predominance of the literary and linguistic material of the school curriculum, and replaced it by subject matter selected from natural scenes or from the environment in which the child was living. Vernacular became the necessary adjunct to this innovation, and German and French, and not Latin and Greek, became the language of the court and of the cultured societies.

The study of Latin and Greek, having lost all its glamour and domination, now found the last refuge under the 'disciplinarians', of whom Locke was the most prominent representative. It was proved beyond doubt that the exclusive attention to the study of the literature of the ancients could in no way be a satisfactory basis of preparing the child for life, especially in view of the new scientific discoveries and changed social and economic conditions. On the psychological side also it could not get any help, as induction, and not empiricism, was held to be the right method of learning. But there was one support to which it clung with all the force that it could muster, and that was the 'faculty doctrine' of the Disciplinary Conception of Education. According to this the mind consisted of various faculties, each capable of developing independently of the others; and as a matter of view, it was believed that it was the process of learning rather than the things learnt that was important in education, 'that a particular activity or experience, specially of an intellectual character, if well selected, produces a power or ability out of all proportion to the expenditure of energy therein ; a power

that will be serviceable in most dissimilar experiences or activities, that will be available in every situation, that will be applicable to the solution of problems presented by a subject, however remote in kind from the one furnishing the occasion for the original disciplinary experience.' It was further believed that the study of subjects such as mathematics and logic and classical languages developed the memory and the reasoning faculty. Grammar was given importance as it was supposed to develope accuracy and precision. The special demands of the professional and technical studies were to be given no consideration, as 'the powers of the mind' once developed by the study of a few selected subjects would spread to and affect all the situations of life, and all that was needed was to direct the ability generated by the formal training of the school into the desired channel.

Many interesting experiments have been made during the past few years on this question of 'spread'; and it has been proved beyond doubt that there is not much truth in it and the study of a particular subject cannot necessarily be useful in other subjects also. Thus the habit of inductive reasoning of the scientist cannot be of any use to him in his linguistic activities where a different method of work is demanded, nor can he be expected to fulfil the function of an artist on the ground that he happened to be very good at his experiments once. Careful observations have been made to determine whether the habit of 'producing neat papers in arithmetic will function with reference to neat written work in other studies and it has been found that there was not the slightest improvement in language and spelling papers, although the improvement in the arithmetic papers was noticeable from the very first.'* Yes, the 'spread' from one subject to another is possible if

*Monroe—Text-book in the History of Education, page 508.

they are similar and allied, and the degree of success in the study of a subject on the strength of the knowledge of another subject will be in direct proportion to the extent to which the former can be associated with the latter.

While studying the Ancient Indian Literature it came to my mind to find out whether the ancient Indian educators of our country have to say anything regarding this doctrine of Formal Training. It was really surprising to find recorded in clear words an opinion which the modern psychologists could arrive at only recently. Thus while emphasising the need of the study of the Nīti Śāstra Śukrāchārya says :—

'Other Śāstras treat of certain specialised branches of human activity (and hence can be useful in a limited sense).*

'But one who studies only one Śāstra cannot decide upon any course of action. The intelligent man, therefore, should inspect many sciences and always study many Śāstras.'†

And while talking about Grammar, Logic, Philosophy and the Science of rituals, practices and ceremonies, he says :—

These sciences, moreover, treat only of the topic specially assigned to each (and give the truth about them only), and hence are always cared for and mastered by such persons only as have need for those teachings (*i.e.* whose knowledge and occupation require a knowledge of those truths).

Here we find a clear disparaging of the Doctrine of Formal Training. The one-sidedness of the mind due to the study of only one branch of knowledge and the inability and

---

* Śukranīti—I-8.

† Śukranīti—I-18-19.

the unfitness of the grammarians, logicians, philosophers and experts in Karma Kāṇḍa to apply the power of their learning to a subject which is not familiar to them is a clear proof of the great Ṛṣi's clear vision of the futility of the belief that the power and discipline of the mind acquired from the study of one subject could spread to and be available for other subjects also. And consequently while mentioning the qualifications of an official of the state he demanded with an equal amount of proficiency the knowledge of all the sciences which were required in virtue of the office he was to hold, and does nowhere urge the supremacy of any one subject or a group of subjects over other subjects as conferring upon the student powers of intellect and wisdom which could help him in all the situations of life. The special requirements of the professional and technical studies which would qualify a man for some particular profession in the society or for some particular office in the service of the state, did not fail to attract his attention and make it clear to him that they had their own place, own method and own principles in education and could in no way be made subordinate to, or understood as by-products of, other sciences. Thus while speaking about the education of the princes he says :—

'He (the king) should make the children of his family well up in the Nīti Śāstra, proficient in archery, capable of undergoing strains and of hearing harsh words and punishments, habituated to the feats of arms, master of all arts and sciences, upright in morals as well as disciplined through his ministers and counsellors.'*

---

* Śukranīti—II, 43-46

See also Kādambarī. The prince Chandrāpīḍa was given a training in 16 various sciences including carpentry, ivory work, &c.

And about the qualifications of an ambassador he says:—

'That man is chosen as ambassador who knows the innermost feelings of other men, who can study their expressions and emotions (Psychology), who has a good memory, knows the conditions of time (History) and place (Geography), can speak well and is fearless.*

And about the qualifications of the commanders and the soldiers of armies he says :—

Those who are well up in Nītiśāstras, the use of arms and ammunitions, manipulations of battle arrays, and the art of management and discipline, who are not too young but of middle age, who are brave, self-controlled, able-bodied, always mindful of their own duties, devoted to their masters, haters of enemies, should be made commanders and soldiers, whether they are Śūdras or Kṣattriyas, Vaiśyas or descended from Mlechchhas.'†

He gave no consideration to the special capabilities or incapabilities of the students on the ground that the discipline of their formal training would make them fit for every obligation that life made upon education; and those of them that were in a position to undergo that training were considered unfit for the higher offices or functions or to receive the privileges and distinctions which would otherwise have been due to them. Śukrāchārya knew well the hollowness and falsity of such a belief and

---

*See also Kādambarī, II. 174—175. See also :—

(1) Matsya Purāṇa, pp. 219, 223. &
(2) Kauṭilya Artha Śāstra, Chapt. VIII.

†Śukranīti, II. 276—280.

advises his people that a great skill and discrimination is required in selecting proper men for the state or even for private business, that for the well being of the society and for the success of organisations it was imperative that the special aptitude of the people should be taken into account, and that they should be given work which is in harmony with the line of their special proficiency. While finishing his advice on the topic, he comes to a very important educational principle which at once shows the psychological achievements of the ancient Indian educators. He says that every individual, whoever he may be and however incapable he may prove himself in his ordinary dealings in the society, has always got some special line of interest which he has selected for himself, and has therefore acquired in that line some proficiency which distinguishes him as a fit man for the corresponding work, exactly in the same way as every letter of a mantra has its own importance and every plant has got its own medicinal value. The wise is one who has the eyes to see the special powers of the individuals, the method to develope those powers and the wisdom to make use of them. Thus we find :—

'There is no letter (of alphabet) which bears no charm, there is no root (of plant) that possesses no medicinal properties. So also there is no man who is (utterly) unfit. But the rarity is the person who can connect.*

According to him every branch of knowledge was to be respected and the king was expected to extend his patronage to all the learned men, irrespective of the science they professed to know. Even the knowledge of Mantras and

---

* Śukranīti—II, 254—255,
See also footnote, page 77, Śukranīti. Panini Office publication, Allahabad.

Tantras entitled the persons to distinctions and aids of the State equally as that of Śrutis. Thus we find :—

Those who practise penances, those who are charitable, those who are proficient in revealed literature (the Vedas) and Smṛtis, those who are well versed in Purāṇas, those who know the Sūtras, the astrologers, the sorcerers, those who are masters of Āyurveda (medical science), those who are versed in the religious rites and ceremonies, those who practise the virtues laid down in the Tantras and those others who are meritorious, intelligent and masters of their passions—these classes of men the king should worship and maintain by stipends, gifts and honours.*

It is now obvious that the learned Ṛṣi was perfectly clear on the point that the study of a particular subject could not help that of another. But at the same time there is ample proof to show that he was not an extremist like Huxley or Spencer who laid the whole emphasis on the contents of study. He believed fully that there was a spread of mental powers from one subject to another if there were common elements or features. Thus in praising the utility of Nīti Śāstra he makes it obligatory for every individual of the society, who wished to promote his socio-economic interest, to have a careful study of it on the ground that it was a system of moral philosophy extracted in the form of an essence, as it were, from the entire mass of social, economical and political experiences and knowledge of man and compiled in the form of a systematic science on the art of living, equally applicable to all irrespective of the department of activity in life. When side by side with this he mentions that all Śāstras have a limited usefulness, being adapted to special purposes and not meant to be of universal interest to man as such he makes his views still clear. Thus we find :—

* Śukranīti—11, 246—250,

'Nīti Śāstra conduces to the desires and interests of all and hence is respected and followed by all.' *

Are these sciences (Grammar, Logic, Philosophy, etc.) of any use to persons following their ordinary affairs or avocations in supplying them with skill and intelligence ? But on the other hand without Nīti the stability of no man's affair can be maintained just as without food the physical body of man cannot be maintained and preserved.' †

"The Nīti Śāstra that is common to the king and the common wealth (people) has been narrated in brief. This remembered by the king is useful to him.' ‡

Even in an age as old as that of Chandra Gupta Maurya it was clear to the Hindu mind that the problem of education was a complex one and that if it was intended that it should be of some practical use to man it was to be made to make ample provision for all the departments of life. Kauṭilya strongly opposes the view of his predecessors who held that the study of two sciences, Vārtā (agriculture, cattle-breeding and trade) and Daṇḍa-Nīti (science of Government) were sufficient to meet all the demands of life and all the other sciences had their origin and end in these.§ He urges that there were a few primary sciences each fixed in response to a particular demand of the human nature and intended for a particular purpose in the human life. Thus there was the spiritual life of the individual and it was to be developed and perfected by the study of the philosophy of religion and the practice of Yoga. Then there were the

---

* Śukranīti I, 23 24,
† S'ukranīti II 20 24.
‡ ,, III 652—653.
§ Kauṭilya Artha Śāstra, Chapter II.

problems of the moral and the social life which were to be fostered and regulated by the study of the Vedas. The physical requirements of life such as wealth, riches, worldly enjoyments and pleasures were also to be given full consideration and for that the individual was taught Vārtā (agriculture, cattle-breeding and trade). And finally lessons on practical wisdom were to be given to promote efficiency, prudence and control by prescribing a course of Daṇḍanīti (science of government).* No where is there even the slightest hint to give preference to any one of these sciences over the rest. Each had its own importance and purpose in education.

And when we find that the ancient Indian Ṛṣi is constantly exhorting the teachers to secure a thorough training of the organs of the sense of the pupils and to make education intensely practical by making them act strictly according to the precepts of the Śāstras taught to them we are at once convinced of the fact that the ancient Indian education was more of a sense-realist, or I should say, of a psychologist than of a 'disciplinarian.' We find :—

'Absence of discrepancy in the perception of sound, touch, colour, flavour and scent by means of the ear, the skin, the eyes, the tongue, and the nose is what is meant by the restraint of the organs of sense. Strict observance of the

---

* Kauṭilya Artha Śāstra Chapter II, and IV. 'He (King) should learn the threefold knowledge (of the Vedas) from those who possess the knowledge thereof (Vedas), and (and of) policy, logic, and knowledge of Self ; but business from the people,' Manu VII 43. Obviously for Manu the knowledge of the Vedas etc. could not help a man in learning the science of "business". The king should learn the Vedas, Politics, Logic, Philosophy, and Temporal Science. He should collect information from ordinary people and keep his senses under control'. Matsya Purāṇa, ccxv 53—55.

precepts of sciences also mean the same ; for the sole aim of education or all the sciences is nothing but restraint of the organs of sense' *.

Yes, there is a passage in the Kauṭilya Artha Śāstra which may well be urged against this statement and may be taken as an indication of the Ṛṣi's disciplinary conception of education. He says at one place that 'when seen in the light of these sciences, the science of Ānvīkṣikī (Philosophy of Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Lokāyata) (Atheism)) is most beneficial to the world, keeps the mind steady and firm in weal and woe alike, and bestows excellence of foresight, speech and action. Light to all kinds of knowledge, easy means to accomplish all kinds of acts and receptacle of all kinds of virtues is the science of Ānvīkṣikī ever held to be.'†

A little reflection will show that so far as the modern views regarding the Doctrine of Formal Training are concerned he may well be classified with the modern educators rather than with the old 'disciplinarians.' We have seen that observations have proved that the transfer of mental powers from one sphere of mental activity to another is possible to the extent there are points of similarity between them. The strength of will, the power of concentration and voluntary attention, the nervous control and the freedom from emotions, passions and excitements which one acquires by the practice of yoga ; or the serenity of thought and the sublimity of ideals, the awereness of the workings of the modes of Prakṛti and hence of the body and the mind itself,

---

* Kauṭilya Artha Śāstra, Chapter VI.
See also the Introduction by S. M. Mitra to 'Hindu mind Training' by an Anglo—Saxon mother—Longmans, Green & Co.

† Kauṭilya Artha Śāstra, Chapter II.

the knowledge of the infallibility of the Law of Karma, the cognisance of the relation between Prakṛti and Puruṣa which are the fruits of the study of philosophy and metaphysics are in fact the requirements of man as man and become on that account the unavoidable accessories of his worldly existence equally serviceable in all the walks of life and equally applicable to all the phases of human activity.

Finally, when we find the ancient Ṛṣi prescribing to the students a universal Code of Dharma* and making it obligatory for each of them to study and follow that Code, not as a part of any special professional or technical studies, but as a collection of precepts fixed for the good of man as man†; and again, when we find them saying to the students that Dharma is to be followed and adhered to for the sake of Dharma,‡ we can, beyond doubt, say that they reached very nearly to the most modern views regarding the problem. This cannot better be explained further than by quoting a passage from Professor Dunville's 'Child-Mind', in which he says :—

'Further it is to be remembered that there are elements which can be made to permeate the whole of life-ideals, purposes, aspirations or ambitions. Moral instruction and training, for instance, whether undertaken at specific times or only incidentally in connection with various lessons, is

---

* Yājnavalkya Smṛti	Chapter II
Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra	Chapter on Studentship
Manu	Chapter II
Viṣṇu Smṛti	Chapter on Duties of a householder
Āpastamba and Gautama	Chapter on Studentship
† Matsya Purāṇa	c cxli 3-4.
Viṣṇu Purāṇa (Wilson)	Book III. Chapter IX.
‡ Bhagavad Gītā	Chapter III

not given with a view to excellence in one particular branch of activity; we want it to have an effect on the whole of life. It is true that such a habit as that f neatness may develope within a certain subject (e. g Arithmetic) and show no signs of spreading to other subjects (e.g. written composition). But if the mere habit is based upon an ideal ("whatever is worth doing is worth doing well") consciously accepted by the individual concerned, it will tend to spread to other subjects.*

---

* Dunville: Fundamentals of Psychology, IX.
" Child Mind page 181.

VI.—HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NYĀYA VAIŚEṢIKA LITERATURE.

Continued from Vol. IV, p. 70.

By Gopi Nath Kaviraj.

V.–HARIDĀSA NYĀYĀLAṄKĀRA BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYĀ.

Of all the Commentaries on the Kārikā portion of the Kusumāñjali the one by Haridāsa, a man of Nadia, has undoubtedly gained the widest currency in Bengal. And it is as the author of this popular annotation of the Kārikās, rather than for any other works, that he is remembered by the modern Pandits of Bengal and Mithilā.

If the tradition* recorded by Mm. Chandra Kānta Tarkālaṅkāra in the Preface (p. i) to his Commentary on Kusumāñjali-Haridāsī (Śaka 1810) regarding Haridāsa's journey to Mithilā for the study of Nyāya Śāstra and his return home with the whole of the Kusumāñjali (including the prose portion also) in his memory be authentic, the event certainly marks an episode of supreme historical interest in the study of philosophy in Bengal. For it inaugurated studies and speculations, and inspired literary activities which have continued into the present day.

To what time Haridāsa should be assigned is a question to which no final answer can be given at present. It is sure that he was earlier than Śaka 1521 or 1599 A. D. when a Ms. of his Commentary on the Āloka was transcribed, and the earlier limit of his age is the date of Āloka itself. I am disposed however to take him as a pupil of Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma.

---

* But see Navadvīpa Mahimā, p. 61.

Among his contributions to the philosophical literature of the country the following are known:

A. Commentaries on

(*a*) Udayanāchārya's

i. Kusumāñjali Kārikās;

(*b*) Gaṅgeśa's

i. Tattva chintāmaṇi (=प्रकाश)*; and

(*c*) Pakṣadhara's

i. Tattva chintāmaṇyālokaṭ†.

VI.-JĀNAKĪNĀTHA BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYA CHŪḌĀMAṆI.

Another writer who has had a large number of commentators and wielded great influence on Contemporary thought was Jānakīnātha, more popularly known as 'Bhaṭṭāchārya Chūḍāmaṇi.' His most famous work was न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जरी, in which he quotes Śivāditya, p. 23, Chintāmaṇikṛt, p. 217, Nyāyabhāskarakṛt, p. 223 and Murāri Miśra, p. 285, and mentions by name his two earlier treatises, *viz.* (*a*) मणिमरीचिनिबन्ध (Ny. Si. Mañj., pp. 18, 185), probably a commentary on Tattvachintāmaṇi; and (*b*) तात्पर्यदीपक (p. 185).

VII.—RAGHUNĀTHA ŚIROMAṆI.

After Vāsudeva the philosopher that calls for special notice here is the great Raghunātha variously styled Śiromaṇi, Tārkika Śiromaṇi or Tārkika Chḍūāmaṇi. He was the

---

* S'āstrī's "Report, 1895-1900", p. 15: Peterson, VI, no. 218, p. 16.

† Mitra's Notices, Nos. 2850-2852. The three Mss. dealing with the three sections of the work, *viz.* प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान & शब्द were copied by one Kandarpa Rāy on the bank of the Ganges (सुरधुनीतटविधे) in S'aka 1523 (त्रियुग्मविशिखक्षणदाधिनाथे), 1522 and 1521 respectively.

greatest figure in Nadia, and next to Gaṅgeśa the greatest in the field. His studies ranged over a wide area, and his philosophical speculations were as deep as they were varied.

The story of Raghunātha's life is not known in detail. He was born in a very humble Brahman family of Pañchakhaṇḍa in Sylhet (Assam), where his ancestor Śrīdhara Āchārya had migrated from Mithilā in 53 Tripurā Era (=643 A. D.) and settled. On the death of his father, Gobinda Chakravartī, at an early age the family was thrown into hopeless confusion. There was no earning hand in the house. The burden of expenses fell on Raghunātha's mother, Sītā Devī, but how long could the poor widow manage it? She soon found herself in great straits. It is said that at this time a batch of pilgrims from her village was setting out on a holy trip to Navadvīpa for a dip in the Ganges. Sītā Devī, with her infant son, felt inclined to accompany this party,—which she did, but before they could reach Nadia Sītā fell seriously ill and was deserted by her companions. Upon recovery she resumed her journey and reached her destination in the company of a kind merchant of the place. At Nadia Sītā took shelter with the great Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma who received Raghunātha into his favour and began to teach him with great care.

It is said that in his early life he had been a student of Vāsudeva, but later on he went to Mithilā in order to study the knotty points of Nyāya Śāstra with Pakṣadhara whose reputation of scholarship attracted him. He is said to have been blind of an eye, and so the tradition runs that when he stood in presence of Pakṣadhara, eager to sit at his feet and drink at that fount of learning of which he had heard so much talked, the latter, being struck by his odd look, questioned him thus:

आखण्डलः सहस्राक्षः विरूपाक्षस्त्रिलोचनः ।
अन्ये द्विलोचनाः सर्वे को भवानेकलोचनः ॥

At this query of Pakṣadhara, Raghunātha was much annoyed at heart, but he was not to be daunted. He retorted readily: "He who is capable of giving an eye (power of vision) to the eyeless is to be considered a real teacher, while the rest are mere names (तदन्ये नामधारिणः)".

On his return from Mithilā, with the laurels yet fresh upon his head Raghunātha won a great name in the country. Students from various parts gathered round him and listened to his learned discourses.

He wrote in the course of his teacher's life a series of works including numerous commentaries and an original treatise, dealing with philosophy;

A. Commentaries on

(*a*) Udayana's

i. Ātmatattvaviveka (=दीपिका or बौद्धधिकार विवृति)* (Stein, p. 135),

and ii. Nyāya Kusumāñjali;

(*b*) Śrī Harṣa's

i. Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍa Khādya (=दीधिति);

(*c*) Vallabha's

i. Nyāyalīlāvatī. This is identical with (*e*) ii.

(*d*) Gaṅgeśa's

i. Tattvachintāmaṇi (=दाधिति);

---

* There are two old Mss. of Raghunātha's Commentary on Ātmatattvaviveka in the Govt. Sanskrit Library Benares—one (called erroneously in the Colophon भावप्रकाश) dated Śaka 1538 and Saṃvat 1672 (= 1616 A. D.) and the other dated Śaka 1516 (= 1594 A. D.)

and (c) Vardhamāna's

i. Kiraṇāvalīprakāśa (दीधिति or विभूति or विवृति),

and ii. Nyāyalīlavatīprakāśa.

B. And an original tract, called

(*a*) पदार्थतत्त्वनिरूपणम्, variously called पदार्थखण्डनम् & पदार्थतत्त्वविवेचनम् .

Among the above treatises the commentry on Chitāmaṇi, known as मणिदीधिति, has been justly the most successful and popular. Since its publication this work has driven all the venerable old commentaries out of fashion, so much so that the very names of works like Āloka (by Pakṣadhara) and Prakāśa (by Ruchidatta) are now well nigh forgotten. The whole host of later writers drew upon him for their inspiration.

Raghunātha was a bold, subtle and original thinker, and it would seem from the words used in the Dīdhiti that he was a bit too highly conscious of his own powers. Cf

विदुषां निवहैरिहैकमत्याद् यददुष्टं यच्च दुष्टम् ।
मयि जल्पति कल्पनाधिनाथे रघुनाथे मनुतां तदन्यथैव ॥
(End of अनुमानदीधिति)

He declares that his commentary on Chintāmaṇi embodied the essence of various Śāstras (सारं निर्णीय निखिलतन्त्राणां) drawn out by study (अध्ययन) and contemplation (भावना).

Raghunātha had unquestionably a real gift for poetical expression rare among the logicians of the Middle Ages. The well known verse

काव्येषु कोमलधियो वयमेव नान्ये
तर्केषु कर्कशधियो वयमेव नान्ये ।
तन्त्रेषु यन्त्रितधियो वयमेव नान्ये
कृष्णेषु संयतधियो वयमेव नान्ये ॥

is attributed to him. His conversation with Pakṣadhara in his first interview amply bears out the vaunt made in the above verse about his claims to poetical excellence.

In regard to Raghunātha's personal convictions concerning the ultimate problems of Life and Spirit with which all philosophy has to deal it is hard to gather anything that would be really of much value. It is not known whether he fell under the spell of Chaitanya's influence, and accepted his creed. But it seems probable that inspite of his recognised place among the few greatest Naiyāyikas of the country, he was a rebel at heart. The following verse prefixed as मङ्गलाचरण to all his works—

ओं नमः सर्वभूतानि विष्टभ्य परितिष्ठते ।
अखण्डानन्दबोधाय पूर्णाय परमात्मने ॥

marks him out at once as one with a decided leaning towards Vedānta, and this against all strained interpretations that have been thrust upon it by later writers.

VIII.—MATHURĀNĀTHA TARKAVĀGĪŚA

It was Mathurānātha on whom fell the proud but heavy task of carrying forward his master's great work and keeping alive the traditional prestige of Navadvīpa. In learning as well as in the power of sustained exertion involved in a work of this kind Mathurānātha was certainly equal to the occasion. He made up his mind, and set himself about the work in right earnest.

That Mathurānātha was Raghunātha's direct pupil appears from the evidence of his referring to the latter as "Bhaṭṭāchārya", the usual form of reference to one's own tutor. Tradition affirms that Mathurānātha's father Śrī Rāma

also had been Raghunātha's pupil. But it seems to me that Śrī Rāma had also been the pupil of Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma.*

He composed the following works :

A. Commentaries on

(a) Udayana's

i. Ātmatattvaviveka

(b) Vallabha's

i. Nyāyalīlāvatī

(c) Gaṅgeśa's

i. Tattva chintāmaṇi

(d) Vardhamāna's

i. Kiraṇāvalīprakāśa,

and ii. Nyayālīlavatīprakāśa.

(e) Pakṣadhara's

i. Tattvachintāmaṇyāloka,

and (f) Raghunātha's

i. Nyāyalīlāvatīprakāśadīdhiti

and ii. Tattva chintāmaṇidīdhiti. It is said that this was his earliest attempt at composition undertaken during his studentship with Raghunātha. His father being highly pleased with his powers thus shown encouraged him warmly and suggested that he should take in hand a Commentary on Tattva chintāmaṇi and write it now in a simple style so as to be of easy comprehension.

---

* Cf. श्रीगोविन्दपदद्वन्द्वं प्रणम्य परमादरात् ।
हृदि कृत्वा च निखिलं सार्वभौमस्य सद्वचः ॥
आत्मतत्त्वविवेकस्य व्याख्यां दीधितिकृत्कृताम् ।
प्रकाशयति यत्नेन श्रीरामः सुधियां मुदे ॥
(Benedictory verses of Śrī Rāma's Com. on Atmatattva vivekadīdhiti.)

and B. Siddhānta rahasyam.

Mathurānātha was a Vaiṣṇava in his personal creed. His father Śrī Rāma Tarkālaṅkara was a great pandit and seems to have been the author of a voluminous Commentary on some work in Nyāyaśāstra*. Probably the commentary was on Chintāmaṇi, and it is interesting to find the son controverting the views of the father. In the Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares, there is a Ms of Śrī Rāma's Commentary, called Ṭippaṇī, on Raghunātha's Ātmatattvavivekadīdhiti.

IX.—BHAVĀNANDA SIDDHĀNTAVĀGĪŚA.

Bhavānanda was one of the ablest representatives of the Nadia School of Thought, and though his works have not enjoyed the same celebrity in Bengal as they have done in the South it does not detract in the slightest degree from their merit. It is a strange fact of which no true historical explanation can yet be rendered that among the commentaries on Bhavānanda none has proceeded from Bengal. It seems that soon after its publication the book was subjected to a severe criticism in certain quarters†, and that in conse-

* Evidently the verse is śliṣṭa here and has to be interpreted in a double sense, being at once applicable to the great Rāma Chandra and Śrī Rāma, Mathurā nātha's father. As explained in reference to the second interpretation, the word न्यायाम्बुधि ought to mean a book prepared by Śrī Rāma, अखिलसम्पत्ति some jagir secured and त्रिभुवन the names of three contemporary scholars named 'Bhuvana' vanquished in debate, by whom his glories were sung. I donot know whether all this is not to be rejected as mere conjecture. End of Mathurā's Commentary on Tattva chintāmaṇi.

† Oppert (2025, 5278 ; II, 9408) mentions a treatise of this kind by one Vajraṭaṅka S'astrin. But it is a comparatively recent production. Vajraṭaṅka seems to have written also a commentary

quence of this the study of the work was left altogether uncared for in the country of its birth*. Thanks are due, however, to Mahādeva Puntamkar for reviving an interest in the study of this valuable but much neglected work and for popularising it through his commentaries.

Bhavānanda left behind him two worthy pupils in Jagadīśa and Rāghavendra†, both of whom distinguished themselves as scholars and made valuable contributions to philosophy and literature.

The name of Bhavānanda's guru is not known. Tradition makes Bhavānanda Mathurānātha's disciple, which on chronological grounds is admissible ; but may it not be that he was Raghunātha's direct pupil ? The following extract taken from his commentary on Anumānadīdhiti, where Raghunātha is referred to as 'Bhaṭṭāchārya', would seem to point to this conclusion :

नीलविशिष्टधूमेऽपि विशेष्यत्वस्योपाधेः सत्त्वेन निरुपाधित्व-साधनव्यापकत्वादिति विशेष्यत्वपाठस्याप्रामाणिकत्वात् तदुपेक्षितं

---

on Bhavānandī, called Bhavānandī prakāśikā (vide Hultzsch, No. 1462, II, pp. 137-8)

* Cf Mahādeva's pungent remarks towards the beginning of his commentary on Bhavānandī (Anumāna) : अनालोच्य सिद्धान्त-वागीशवाण्यां वृथा सूपितः (?) पण्डितैर्गौडजातैः। यदुद्भावितं दूषणाभासवृन्द तदुद्धारणार्थो ममोद्योग एषः ॥

† Rāghavendra was much loved by his tutor. So says Chirañjīva in the Vidvanmodataraṅgiṇī :

अधीयानमुद्दिश्य चाध्यापकोऽयं भवानन्दसिद्धान्तवागीश ऊचे ।
अयं कोऽपि देवोऽनवद्यातिविद्याचमत्कारधारामपरां बिभर्त्ति ॥

Chapter i, verse 17.

भट्टाचार्य्यशिरोमणिभिरिति । I hold, therefore, pending further evidence to the contrary, that Bhavānanda was Raghunātha's junior pupil and that on the latter's death or probably on his retirement through the infirmities of age, when teaching was impossible, Bhavānanda completed his studies with Mathurānātha. And this would be in keeping with Bhavānanda's own statement in his commentary on the Dīdhiti :

नमस्कृत्य गुरून् सर्वान् निगूढं मणिदीधितौ ।
श्रीभवानन्दसिद्धान्तवागीशेन प्रकाश्यते ॥

Here is a list of works written by Bhavānanda :

A. Commentaries on

(a) Gaṅgeśa's

i. Tattvachintāmaṇi

(b) Pakṣadhara's

i. Tattvachintāmaṇyāloka (= आलोकसारमञ्जरी)

(c) Raghunātha's

i. Tattvachintāmaṇidīdhiti (= दीधितिगूढार्थ-प्रकाशिका)

B.

(a) शब्दार्थसारमञ्जरी

(b) कारकचक्र

(c) दशलकारसारमञ्जरी

X.—GUṆĀNANDA VIDYĀVĀGĪŚA BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYA

Guṇānanda, better known as Vidyāvāgīśa Bhaṭṭāchārya, was a pupil of Madhusūdana and wrote a large number of commentaries, viz. on

(a) Udayana's

i. Nyāyakusumāñjaliprakaraṇa (= न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलि-विवेक)*. The work is called तात्पर्यविवेक in the Ms of the Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares.

* This is a commentary on the whole of Kusumāñjali, and not on the metrical portion of it only, as noted by Mr. Chakravarti (J. A. S. B., 1915, p. 279).

(b) Vardhamāna's

i. Guṇa Kiraṇāvaliprakāśa (=गुणविवृतिविवेक or तात्पर्यसन्दर्भ)

(c) Pakṣadhara's

i. Tattvachintāmaṇyāloka, Śabda section (=शब्दालोकविवेक), and

(d) Raghunātha's

i. Anumāna Dīdhiti (=°विवेक)

ii. Nyāyalīlāvatiprakāśadīdhiti (=°विवेक)

iii. Atmatattvavivekadīdhiti (=°विवेक)

and iv. Guṇakiraṇāvaliprakāśadīdhiti. This work is identical with (b) i.

His time is unknown, but it may be surmised that he lived about the end of the 16th century. This is proved by the fact that there exists in the India Office Library a Ms. of his Guṇavivṛtiviveka with 1534 Śaka (वेदबाणाग्नियुते शकाब्दे) or 1612 A. D. *as the date of its transcription. Besides, as his tutor cannot be identical with the famous author of the Advaitasiddhi the time here proposed for him would not seem incompatible. The fact that he was criticised by the Jain Logician Yaśovijayagaṇi †in the latter's Nyāya Khaṇḍana Khādya presents no chronological difficulty.

XI.—RĀMA RUDRA TARKAVĀGĪŚA

Rudra, to be distinguished from another and more famous Rudra surnamed Nyāya Vāchaspati‡, was grandson

* Not 1622 A. D. as stated by Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa in his Indian Logic, p. 468.

† 1608—1688 A. D.

‡ Aufrecht (Cat. Cat., Vol. I, pp 528—529) has erroneously placed the works of the two Rudras under the single name of Rudra Nyāya Vāchaspati and made him the grandson of Bhavānanda. In Vol. III, p. 112, however, the name of Rudra Nyāyavāchaspatis, grandfather appears correctly as Vidyāvāchaspati.

of Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīṣa on whose Kārakachakra he wrote a Commentary. In the Colophon he distinctly attributes this work to his grandfather (पितामह).

Rudra wrote another Commentary on the Siddhānta-muktāvali, where he calls his father (तात) Śrī Rāma (श्रीरामधीरेश). Madhusūdana may have been the name of his Guru. Ind. Off., p. 674.

XII.—RĀMABHADRA SĀRVABHAUMA.

Very little is known about Rāmabhadra's parentage or personal history except that he was the guru of the famous Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra*. In the introduction to many of his commentaries (e. g. on the Padārthatattvanirūpaṇa) he calls himself the son of one Chūḍamaṇi whom Hall identifies with the Tārkikachūḍāmaṇi Raghunātha†.

He was the author of—

A. Commentaries on

(a) Gotama's

i. Nyāya Sūtras. This commentary is of the nature of a gloss and is generally known by the name न्यायरहस्यम्. Copies of this work are very rare. I examined a complete Ms of the with Pandit Mukunda Śāstri of Benares, which has since been acquired for the Sanskrit College Library Benares.

---

* Cf Jagadīśa in Śabdaśaktiprakāśikā,— इति पुनर्न्यायरहस्ये ऽस्मद्गुरुचरणाः ।

† Mr. Chakravartī (J.A.S.B., 1915, p. 281) and Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Ind. Logic, p. 468) wrongly make Rāmabhadra the son of Bhavānatha and Bhvanī. The error is apparently due to an original confusion on the part of Aufrecht (Cat. Cat., I, p. 517) and Stein (p. 148).

(b) Udayana's

i. Kusumāñjali Kārikās*. This was once a very popular commentary and shared the reputation of Haridāsa's work in Bengal.

ii. Guṇa Kiraṇāvali (गुणरहस्यम्)

(c) Raghunātha's

i. Padārthatattvavivechana (°प्रकाश). In this work Rāmabhadra refers to the views of his father (p. 112) and of his grandfather (p. 111).

---

* It may be observed that Rāmabhadra was not the author of the entire commentary which in Bengal passes under his name. The earlier part of the work, where the author names his parents as Bhavanātha and Bhavānī and where he remarks that in interpreting the text he has closely followed the instructions received from his father ('ततोऽधिकां पितुर्व्याख्यामाख्यातुमयमुद्यमः'), is strongly reminiscent of S'aṅkara Miśra and must have proceeded from his pen. And as a matter of fact, for this very reason, the whole commentary is ascribed to Śaṅkara Miśra in Mithilā. To me, however, it seems that the commentary known as Āmoda in Mithilā (noticed by Aufrecht in Oxf. Cat., p.243 and by Dr. Jhā in his perface to Vādivinoda) and as Rāmabhadrī in Bengal, (notified in Mitra, No. 525) was not the work of a single author but the joint production of S'aṅkara and Rāmabhadra : it had been commenced by S'aṅkara Miśra but for some reason or other left incomplete by him, and was subsequently completed by Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma. This will explain the origin of the erroneous statement in regard to the parentage of Rāmabhadra. That this is not a mere supposition will be clear from an actual entry in the following extract from the commentary : इत्यन्तं शङ्करमिश्रकृतं ततः सार्वभौमीयम् (Fol 6a 2-5 of a very old Ms, in possession of Pandit Harihar Śāstrī of Benares). But the full text of S'aṅkara Miśra's "Āmoda" is also available, a copy of which exists in the Sanskrit College Library, Benares. See *ante* (Vol. III,

and B. (a) सिद्धान्तरहस्यम्. This work is little known but it is referred to in (c) i (Reprint from the Pandit p. 96) and therefore preceded it.

(b) सिद्धान्तसार (Burnell, p. 121 a).

and (c) सुवर्णतैजसत्ववाद (Hultzsch, No. 1404, II. p. 133). In this work Rāmabhadra refers the current notion of the logicians regarding the igneous character of gold.

XIII.—JAGADIŚA TARKĀLAṄKĀRA.

Among the disciples of Bhavānanda none was so eminent as the famous Jagadīśa who, with Mathurānātha and Gadādhara, forms the small band of post-Dīdhitian Logicians in Bengal. Jagadīśa is said to have been a descendant of Sanātana Miśra, the father-in-law of Chaitanya Deva and lived probably in the second quarter of the seventeenth century.*

From Jagadīśa's statement in the Nyāyarahasya it appears that he was also the pupil of Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma.

He was the third son of Yādava chandra Vidyāvāgīśa and had five brothers. He had two sons, i. e. Raghunātha, the

---

p. 147). The late Mahāmahopādhyāya Maheśa Chandra Nyāyaratna (in his 'Brief Notes on the Modern Nyāya System of Philosophy and its technical terms', p. 5) ascribed this commentary on the Kusumāñjalikārikās to one Rāmabhadra Siddhāntavāgīśa, whose name is associated by popular tradition with the establishment of the image of Poḍā-mā at Nadia and whom he takes to be the earliest exponent of Nyāya in Bengal (earlier than Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma). But this is evidently without any foundation in fact.

*A Ms of Jagadīśa's Kāvya prakāśa rahasya was copied by one of his pupils in Śaka 1599 (= 1677 A. D.).

author of Sānkhyatattvavilāsa, and Rudreśvara, the father of Rāmabhadra Siddhāntavāgīśa.

Jagadīśa was the author of

A. Commentaries on

(a) Praśastapāda's

i. Padārtha Dharma Saṅgraha (=सूक्ति). This extends to Dravya section only.

(b) Gangeśa's

i. Tattvachintāmaṇi

(c) Raghunātha's

i. Nyāyalīlāvatīdīdhiti.

ii. Tattvachintāmaṇididhīti (=प्रकाशिका).

This is popularly known as Jāgadīśī.

B.)a) शब्दशक्ति प्रकाशिका

(b) तर्कामृत

XIV.—RĀGHAVENDRA BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYA ŚATĀVADHĀNA.

Next to Jagadiśa the most remarkable person among Bhavānanda's disciples was Rāghavendra Bhaṭṭāchārya. In the first chapter of Vidvanmodataraṅgiṇī, a work of unique interest by Chirañjīva Bhaṭṭāchārya, the author, who calls himself Rāghava's son, gives a short but interesting account of his own family. He claims descent from a native of Rādhāpur, who is said to have been a high authority on ceremonies relating to sacrifice; and it is related that once by virtue of his extraordinary powers of sacrifice he was able to ensure the safety of the county of Gauḍa from what is naively described as the inroads of rākṣasas. He belonged to Kāśyapa gotra and his descendants ranked in Gauḍa as the noblest in social scale. His descendant in the 8th remove

was Kāśinātha Sāmudrikāchārya, a great palmist, physiognomist and fortune-teller*. He had three sons, Rājendra, Rāghavendra and Maheśa.

Rāghavendra was certainly the most accomplished of the three brothers. He obtained the title of Bhaṭṭāchārya Śatāvadhāna while he was yet a boy of only 16 years of age. He read various Śāstras in the ṭol of Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgiśa, and became in course of time a past master in the Science of Dialectics and a great controversialist. Rāghavendra was a poet of extraordinary powers, and his Ślokaśatī will ever remain a monument of his marvellous skill in this art. Chirañjīva quotes the following tributary verses written by two different poets in praise of Rāghavendra's wonderful gifts :

One poet says :—

(1) अहं हरिहरः सिद्धे रविलम्ब सरस्वती ।
साक्षाच्छतावधानस्त्वमवतीर्णा सरस्वती ॥

The other says :

(2) पुंरूपादरणी साक्षादवतीर्णा सरस्वती ।
जितः शतावधानतो विष्णुनापि न जिष्णुना ॥

All this goes to shew that Rāghavendra was held in great esteem by his contemporaries. Bhavānanda was struck with his genius :

अधीयानमुद्दिश्य चाध्यापकोऽयं भवानन्दसिद्धान्तवागीश ऊचे ।
अयं कोऽपि देवोऽनवद्यातिविद्याचमत्कारधारामपरां बिभर्ति ॥

Rāghavendra is credited with three works,—none however on Nyāya,—by his son, viz. श्लोकशती, मन्त्रार्थदीप and रामप्रकाश.

XV.—RĀMABHADRA SIDDHĀNTAVĀGĪŚA.

Rāmabhadra Siddhāntavāgiśa, a resident of Navadvīpa, is said to have been the son of Rudreśvara and grandson of

---

* सामुद्रिकेशोऽथ समुद्रकल्पः सामुद्रिकाचार्य इति प्रसिद्धिम् ।
लेभे नृणामाकृतिदर्शनेन फलं वदन्भूतभविष्यदादि ॥

Jagadiśa. He was the pupil of his grandfather. Cf. the verse 2 at the beginning of his commentary, called **प्रबोधिनी** (Mittra 3367 or **सुबोधिनी**), the only work passing under his name on Jagadiśa's Śabdaśaktiprakāśikā* :

> **गुरुमिव गुरुमिह नत्वा तत्कृतशब्दशक्तिप्रकाशिकायाम् ।**
> **श्रीरामभद्रसुकृती कुरुते टीकां मुदे सुधियः ॥**

Skt. Coll. Catl. p. 265, No. 460.

XVI.—GAURĪKĀNTA SĀRVABHAUMA BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYA.

Among the Commentators of Tarkabhāṣā Gaurīkānta's name occupies perhaps a unique position, both on account of the exhaustive treatment of the topics raised in the text as well as for its great bulk. His Commentary on Tarkabhāṣā is certainly his best production, and perhaps the most thorough work of its kind existing in the literature.

As to his time it may be roughly fixed in this way :

In the work just mentioned Gaurīkānta alludes very frequently to the views of Balabhadra and Govardhana and vehemently denounces them as erroneous†. Govardhana's age has been ascertained to be the 16th century, which therefore furnishes the upper limit of Gaurīkānta's life period ;

---

* This Commentary is wrongly ascribed to Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma in the Preface (p. 2) to Padārthatattvanirūpaṇa (V.P. Dube's Edition).

† See, for instance, the following extract from the Bhāvārthadīpikā where the definition of कारण by Balabhadra and Govardhana has been attacked by Gaurīkānta : यत्तु अनुभवत्वव्याप्यजात्यवच्छिन्नकार्यतानिरूपितकारणाश्रयत्वे सति व्यापारवत्त्वे सति प्रमाकरणत्वमिति गोवर्द्धनेनोक्तं, यच्च यथार्थज्ञानकारणत्वे सति व्यापारवत्त्वे सति अनुभवत्वव्याप्यजात्यवच्छिन्नकार्यताप्रतियोगिकारणताश्रयत्वं प्रमाणत्वमिति तदेव लक्षणं परिवर्त्य बलभद्रेणोक्तं तद्द्वयमप्यशुद्धम् ।

19

the other or lower limit, however, is afforded by the age of Mādhava Deva (i. e. the end of 17th century) who quotes and criticises the opinion of Gaurīkānta in his own तर्कभाषासारमञ्जरी। Hence it may be concluded with tolerable certainty that. Gaurīkānta lived in the early part of the 17th century.

Gaurīkānta's works are :

A Commentaries on

(a) Praśastapāda's Padārthadharma Saṁgraha. This work, unknown to Aufrecht, I find mentioned under the title of वैशेषिकभाष्य-विवरण in his Bhāvārthadīpikā (Benares College Ms. 156, fol. 3b).

(b) Keśava Miśra's

i. Tarkabhāṣā (=भावार्थदीपिका). This work is also called विवरण in the colophon of the chapter of the Benares College Ms. 156, fol. 2 5b.

Commenting on the nature of anubhava in his Commentary on the Tarkabhāṣā Gaurīkānta quotes the following verse and says that it occurs in the text in some Mss ;

संविद्‌ भगवती देवी स्मृत्यनुभववेदिका ।
अनुभूतिः स्मृतेरन्या स्मृतिः संस्कारमात्रजा ॥

Fol. 9b.

(c) Raghunātha's

i. Tattva Chintāmaṇidīdhiti.
This work, too, is not mentioned in Aufrecht, but is referred to as मणिदीधिति विवेचन (Ms 156, fol. 22b) in connection with the discussion of प्रत्यासत्ति.

(d) Annam Bhaṭṭa's

i. Tarkasaṅgraha

B

(a) सद्युक्तिमुक्तावली.

Gaurīkānta's reference to Sārvabhauma (Benares College Ms. 163, fol. 138b) in conjunction with Dīdhitikāra must be understood as standing for the great Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma, and not for Rāmabhadra or Kṛṣṇadāsa. It is not yet known whether Gaurīkānta was a poet, but he describes himself as कवितार्किकचक्रवर्त्ती in the colophon of the Pratyaksa section of his Bhāvārtha dīpikā (Benares College Ms. 156.)

XVII.—HARIRĀMA TARKAVĀGĪŚA * (1625 A. D.)

Harirāma's reputation as an eminent Naiyāyika of the Nadia school does not rest so much upon his own productions, as upon his relation as tutor to the great Gadādhara Bhaṭṭāchārya. But there is no doubt that he was the recognised head of the then Naiyāyika community of Navadvīpa. It is said that he used to get the highest reward in all public assemblies, a distinction which has invariably been confined to the scholar occupying the foremost rank at Nadia for erudition and controversial eloquence. Of the long list of his works the greater part are already forgotten, except one or two little pieces which are sometimes used by inquisitive students. His works were numerous and strikingly original. Here are some names :

A Commentaries on

(a) Śivāditya's

i. Saptapadārthī.

---

* Also surnamed Tarkālaṅkāra.

(b) Gangeśa's

i. Tattva Chintāmaṇi. The author of 'Navadvīpa Mahimā' describes it as a mere adaptation from Chintāmaṇi, and not an actual commentary.

B. A large number of brief tracts, *e.g.*

(*a*) आचार्यमत रहस्य, vindicating Udayana's theory of anumiti *viz.*—

"वह्निव्याप्यधूमवान् पर्वत इत्यादिपरामर्शात् वह्निव्याप्तिविशिष्टधूमादिविषयिनी वह्निव्याप्यधूमवान् पर्वतो वह्निमानित्यनुमितिरुत्पद्यते ।"

(b) न्यायनव्यमतविचार

(c) रत्नकोशविचार

(d) विषयतावाद

(e) प्रत्यासत्तिविचार

(f—k) मङ्गलवाद, प्रमाणप्रमोद, अनुमितिपरामर्शबाधबुद्धि, प्रतिबन्धकताविचार, विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यबोधविचार, नव्यधर्मितावच्छेदकता ।

Harirāma died a ripe old man. Gadādhara* and Raghudeva† were his principal students.

Harirāma quotes, among other works, from one Nyāya Kaustubha. But it is evident that this can not have been the work of the famous Mahādeva Punatamkar who was his successor. In the Govt Sanskrit Library Benares, there is a Ms of Raghudeva's Commentary on the Kusumāñjali Kārikās transcribed by Mahādeva in his own hand. As Raghudeva was Harirāma's pupil Mahādeva could not have lived before the latter.

---

* Hall, p. 55.

† Weber, I. p. 204 (Ms. 685, Dravyasārasaṅgraha of Raghudeva): Peterson, VI. pp. 15-16.

As a teacher of Raghudeva Harirāma may be assigned to the first quarter of the 17th century.

XVIII.—JAYARAMA NYĀYAPAÑCHĀNANA.

From the introductory verse (No. 1) of his commentary on the Dīdhiti it appears that Jayarāma was the pupil of one Rāmabhadra Bhaṭṭāchārya *. But who this Rāmabhadra might have been there is no means of ascertaining. Mr. Chakravarti takes him as the author of Nyāyarahasyam which is likely, but it seems to me more probable that he was the same as the pupil of Jagadīśa. Jayarāma's time can be determined with exactness and he may be assigned to the third and fourth quarters of the 17th century. For there is evidence to show that he was living at Benares in Saṃvat 1714 or 1657 A. D.† and composed one of his works in Saṃ 1750 or 1693 A. D.

He is known to have been the author of the following works :

A. Commentaries on

(a) Gautama's

i. Nyāya Sūtras (न्यायसिद्धान्तमाला). The work contains the following references :

पदार्थमाला, $3b^2$, $6a^3$, $8a^2$; प्रमेयतत्त्वबोधकृत :, $4a^1$; प्रमेय-तत्त्वबोध:, $4b^5$, $11b^{1-2}$; तत्त्वबोधे वर्धमान :, $5a^3$; वर्द्धमानः, $9b^6$, $10a^2$, $16b^2$; वर्धमानादयः, $8a^b$; नव्याः, $4b^3$, $10b^2$, $13a^5$, $13b^3$ $116b^1$; प्रशस्तपादभाष्य, $4b^6$; भाष्यकृतः, $13a^5$; वार्त्तिककृतः, $6b^5$;

---

* मूर्ध्न्याधाय च रामभद्रचरणद्वन्द्वारविन्दद्वयम् । Line 3

† In the 'Decision' of Benares Pandits dated Saṃ 1714 the name of Pt. Jayarāma Nyāyapañchānana occurs in the list of the signatories. This 'Decision' has been published by R. S. Pimputkar in his 'चितलेभट्टप्रकरण' (1926), pp 78-81.

वार्त्तिकादयः, 8a[7]; वार्त्तिककारः, 13b[3]; न्यायनिबन्धप्रकाशः, 12b[4]; टीकाकृतः, 14b[5]; उपाध्यायाः, 20a[5], 29b[7]; मणिकृतः, 28a[5]; मणिकृदनुयायिनः, 75a[2]; मिश्राः, 29b[7]; दीधितिकृतः, 32a[6-7]; 75a[5]; आचार्याः, 34b[6], रत्नकोषकृतः, 83b[6-7]; वागीशः, 96b[5] (the view is refuted by the author); प्राञ्चः, 116b[1]; मणिकण्ठ, 135b[4], 135a[6]; शबरस्वामिनः, 145a[1].

It was composed in Saṃ 1750 or 1693 A. D.*

(b) Udayana's

i. Kusumāñjali Kārikās (विवृति). It is referred to in his Padārthamālā. †

(c) Pakṣadhara's

I. Tattvachintāmaṇyāloka (विवेक). Referred to as Ālokarahasya in his commentary on the Kusumāñjali kārikās.

(d) Raghunātha's

i. Guṇa Kiraṇāvalīprakāśa dīdhiti

ii. Tattvachintāmaṇi dīdhiti (=गूढार्थविद्योत or दीधितिविवृति).

B.

(a) पदार्थमाला or पदार्थमणिमाला or शब्दार्थमाला ‡. It is a valuable treatise, quite original in its treatment. The author declares his object in writing this tract as purely critical :

---

* Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Indian Logic, p. 478.

† अधिकं कारिकाव्याख्यायामनुसन्धेयम् (fol. 74b[4] of Ms 168 belonging to Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares). Three Mss of this work exist in the Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares.

‡ Śabdarthamala is not a distinct work, as Mr. Chakravartī (J. A. S. B., 1915, p. 283) and Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Ind.

आष्याद्युक्तिषु हीनयुक्तिषु रतिः प्रेक्षावतां प्रेक्ष्यते
ह्यायार्थे विहितापि युक्तिरहिता वाणी कचिन्नद्यते ।
मत्वैव जयराम एष विपुलैः सद्युक्तिमुक्ताफलैः
प्रव्यक्तं वितनोति कोविदमुदे शब्दार्थमालामिमाम् ॥

From the above it appears that the work was intended to form a kind of supplement to the Praśastapāda bhāṣyam and the Kiraṇāvalī.

(b) अन्यथाख्यातिविचार
(c) लघुसन्निकर्षवाद
(d) न्यायमाला.

XIX.—GADĀDHARA BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYA (1650 A. D.)

Gadādhara, son of Jīvācharya and a younger contemporary of Jagadisa, was a Varendra Brahman, originally of Lakṣmīchapar in the district of Pabna*. He came to Nadia for prosecution of studies; and being admitted to the *tol* of Harirāma Tarkavāgīśa, the greatest living professor of Nyāyaśāstra, he was soon able through diligence and steady application to win for himself the favour of his tutor and rise into prominence. It is said that owing to Harirāma's death before completion of his studies Gadādhara could not secure any title of distinction.

Logic, p. 478) hold, but only another name of the Padārthamālā. The author himself employs the two names indifferently for this work. Thus in the second benedictory verse at the beginning (पदार्थमाला बालानां &c) and in the second verse at the end of the Dravya section (पदार्थमाला यदि नाम बाला &c) the name Padārthamālā is used, but in verse 1 at the end of the Dravya section the work is referred to under the name of Śabdārthamālā (वितनोति शब्दार्थमालामिमाम्).

* Navadvīpamahimā, p. 82. In the copy of the India Office Ms. of Gadādhara's Anumānadīdhitiṭippaṇī, he is called महामहोपाध्याय गौडदेशीयः गदाधर चक्रवर्ती (Ind. Off. Cat., p. 607).

It was Harirāma's dying wish that on his death Gadādhara should succeed him to professorship in his *ṭol*, as otherwise its reputation would not be maintained. Gadādhara readily consented to comply with this last wish of his tutor, and began to teach, but he soon found to his great disappointment that no students cared to come up to him for study; and even the old batch deserted him one by one. His absence of a " conventional title" of merit was a bar to his real claim to tutorship. However, Gadādhara was not a man to allow his spirits to be dumped by this. He left his tutor's place, and founded a school of his own in a delightful little garden on the wayside of the mainroad leading to the Ganges. Here in the cooling shades of the trees he made his abode. In the absence of any students coming to hear him he would deliver his lectures before the creepers and plants of flowers. Pandits coming to the garden for plucking flowers and passing by it on their way to the Ganges for bathing would often pause to hear him and found his discourses as learned as attractive. Gadādhara's fame thus spread around within a remarkably short period and drew towards him flocks of students from various quarters*.

He was the author of—

A. Commentaries on

(a) Udayana's

i. Nyāyakusumāñjali

(b) Pakṣadhara's

i. Tattvachintāmaṇyāloka

(c) Raghunātha's

i. Atmatattvaviveka dīdhiti. Tradition places this among the earliest works of Gadādhara.

ii. Tattvachintāmaṇidīdhiti.

---

* Navadvīpa Mohimā, pp. 82-84; Shastri, Notices II.

B.

(a) ब्रह्मनिर्णय

and (b) 64 short treatises, known as Vādārthas, dealing each with a separate topic of the new school of Nyāya Philosophy, such as i. विषयतावाद, ii. शक्तिवाद, iii. मुक्तिवाद, iv. व्युत्पत्तिवाद, v. सादृश्यवाद,-vi. रत्नकोशवाद,-vii. कारणतावाद, viii. अनुमितिमानसतावाद, ix. नव्यमतवाद,-x. विधिस्वरूपवाद, &c. &c.

Gadādhara was a Vaiṣṇava, being a votary of the Vṛndāvana form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (नन्दतनूज), but he did not fail to pay due reverence to the other forms of the Divinity. Cf. his benediction in the Chintāmaṇidīdhiti (Anumāna) where he invokes the blessings of Durgā (गिरीन्द्र दुहिता).

His principal student was Jayarāma Tarkālaṅkāra (S. V.).

XX.—RAGHUDEVA NYĀYĀLAṄKĀRA (1650 A.D.)

Raghudeva was also Harirāma's disciple, and plainly refers to him as his guru in Dravyasārasaṅgraha (Weber, I, p. 204)*. He is said to have been Bhavānanda's descendant. He wrote the following works :

---

* In Nañvāda (Oxf., p. 245, Ms. 617) he names his guru Tarkavāgīśvara, which must be understood, in conjunction with the above statement, as applying definitely to Harirāma.

Bodas in his Introduction to Tarkasaṅgraha, p. 45 and Pt. V. P. Dube in the preface of his edition of Padārthatattvanirūpaṇa, p. 2, wrongly make Raghudeva Mathurānātha's disciple. This mistake was evidently occasioned by the fact of both Mathurānātha and Harirāma bearing a common title (*viz.* Tarkavāgīśa). But away from the above extract which throws light on the whole question, the mistake will also be apparent when it is known that Raghudeva was Bhavānanda's descendant in the 3rd or 4th

A Commentaries on

(*a*) Kaṇāda Sūtras

(*b*) Udayana's

i. Nyāya Kusumāñjali Kārikās*

(*c*) Gaṅgeśa's

i. Tattva Chintāmaṇi. This commentary is known as गूढार्थदीपिका, or popularly by the name of the author as Raghudevī.

(*d*) Raghunātha's

i. Padārtha tattva nirūpaṇa.

ii. Tattva Chintāmaṇi didhiti.

iii. Ākhyāta vāda.

B (*a*) विषयताविचार। Raghudeva refers to this in his commentary on Padārthatattvanirūpaṇa (Pandit Ed., p. 78).

(*b*) द्रव्यसारसंग्रह,

(*c*) निरुक्तिप्रकाश,

and (*d*) a certain number of tracts, such as (i) विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्य-बोधविचार, (ii) अनुमितिपरामर्शविचार, (iii) सामग्रीवाद, (iv) प्रतियोगिज्ञानकारणताविचार &c. &c.

Raghudeva is sometimes identified with the new Kaṇāda, but this does not seem to be correct. For we know that Kaṇādas's guru was one Chūḍāmaṇi, as mentioned in his own Bhāṣāratna and not Harirāma or even Jagadīśa (S V. Kaṇāda).

---

remove (N. Mahimā, p. 80) and that the latter was Mathurānātha's direct pupil. But the verses at the end of the Nañvāda (अत्र सूक्तं दुरुक्तं वा यत् किञ्चिज् जल्पितं मया। तत् सर्वं जगदीशस्य प्रीत्यर्थ-मित्यनिन्दितम्) seem to show that he read also with Jagadīśa. Or perhaps the word Jagadīśa means God and nothing more.

* There is a Ms of this work, dated Saṃ 1739 (= 1682 A. D.) in the Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares. It was transcribed by the great Naiyāyika Mahādeva Puntamkar.

On the basis of this supposed identity between Raghudeva & Kaṇāda and of the fact that Śaṅkara Miśra pays obeisance to Kaṇāda in the Upaskāra, Bodas makes Śaṅkara pupil of Raghudeva.

Raghudeva lived at Benares. Mm Haraprasad Śastri, in his Report on Sanskrit Mss (1906-7—1910-11, p. 6), assigns him to the beginning ot the 18th Century. But this date is certainly wrong. In the Govt. Sanskrit College Library, Benares, there is a manuscript of Raghudeva's commentary on the Kusumāñjali Kārikās transcribed by Mahādeva Puntamkar in Saṃ 1739 or 1682 A.D. Raghudeva was therefore of an earlier date. The 'Decision' of Benares Pandits referred to above contains the signature of Raghudeva. This 'Decision' is dated Saṃvat 1714 (कृतकगाब्दे) and Śaka 1579 (नन्दशैलशरभूमितशाके), that is 1657 A, D. which is consequently the exact date of Raghudeva.

XXI.—JAYARĀMA TARKĀLAṄKĀRA (1675 A. D.)

Jayarāma's father Jayadeva was the court pandit of Putia in the District of Rajshahee, and had been originally a native of Pabna. In old age he retired to Navadvīpa where he settled permanently. Jayarāma is said to have received his education in the *tol* of Gadādhara, and wrote a commentary, the only work by him yet known to us, on his teacher's Śaktivāda*.

His most famous pupil was Viśvanātha Pañchānana, the author of Bhāṣāparichcheda and Muktāvalī†.

---

* Hall, however, assigns it to a pupil of Jayarāma (p. 56).

† The line of Viśvanatha's teachers is given thus in the popular saying : हेरर गदा, गदार जय । जयेर विशु लोके कय ॥ which gives us the order—Harirāma Tarkavāgīśa—Gadādhara Bhaṭṭāchārya—Jayarāma Tarkālaṅkara—Viśvanātha Pañchānana.

XXII.—VIŚVANATHA NYĀYASIDDHĀNTA. PANCHANANA (1654)

Of all the authors of Nyaya tracts whose aim has been to bring the subject within easy reach none has achieved a greater success than Viśvanātha, the eldest son of Vidyānivāsa, of Nadia.* His Bhāṣāparichcheda with his own gloss upon it named Nyāya Siddhānta Muktāvalī † occupies even now the foremost position among the manuals on Nyāya Vaiśeṣika philosophy, and for a learned and lucid interpretation of the original sūtras of Gotama no better work is available than his Nyāyasūtravṛtti. His other works are less known but equally interesting. As to religious belief he was a Vaiṣṇava and passed the last years of his life in retirement and devotion at Brindavan. It was here that he composed, in 1576 Śaka or 1654 A. D., his learned commentaries on Nyāya Sūtra in pursuance of Śiromaṇi's interpretation. He belonged to the second and third quarters of the 17th Century, and was the author of the following books :

A Glosses on

(a) Gotama's

i. N. Sutras (न्यायसूत्रवृत्ति), composed in 1654.

---

* His younger brothers were Nārāyaṇa and his father was the son of the younger brother of the great Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma (p. 119) and is said to have been highly honoured by Raja Mansingh of Amber and defeated in a public assembly at the Court of Todarmall the great scholar Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa of Benares.

† This work reminds one of a less known but similarly named treatise on Vedanta, viz. Vedānta Siddhānta Muktāvalī by Prakāśānanda Svāmī. Prakāśānanda was undoubtedly an earlier author and it was his work which appears to have inspired the title of Viśvanātha's gloss on his own Kārikās.

(b) Raghunātha Śiromaṇi's

i. Padārtha tattvanirūpaṇam

(c) His own

i. Bhāṣāparichchheda, a collection of couplets, summarising the doctrines of the Vaiśeṣika philosophy. The work purports to have been written for the use of the author's nephew (?) Rājīva. There is a copy of this work belonging to Nṛsinha Dīkṣita, dated 1719 Saṃ. or 1662 A. D.

B.

(a) न्यायतन्त्रबोधिनी

(b) सुवर्थतत्त्वालोक

XXIII.—TRILOCHANADEVA

Trilochana was the pupil of one Rāma, a professor of Nadia, and refers to Vāchaspati Miśra, Śiromaṇi Bhaṭṭāchārya and Guṇānanda*. His works are

A. Commentaries on

(a) Udayana's

i. Kusumānjali (=कुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्या)

and (b) Viśvanātha's

i. Nyāyasiddhāntamuktāvalī, called लोचनी after the author's name (Hultzsch, II, p. 132, no. 1397) †.

---

* See Hall, p. 84.

† Aufrecht notes that this work is based on an earlier commentary on the Muktāvalī by Madhusūdana, named Mahāprabhā (Cat. Cat., III, p. 89).

XXIV.—RĀMA KṚṢṆA BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYA CHAKRAVARTI.

In introducing his commentary on Rāma Kṛṣṇa's Tarkāmṛta Kṛṣṇa Kānta Vidyāvāgīśa gives a brief but interesting outline of the early history of the author's line. He says that in the village of Kotaliparah, which as we know even now maintains a position of intellectual eminence in Bengal, there once lived a Brahmin, named Govinda, who was well versed in the Kalāpa system of Grammar and in Smṛti and used to teach these subjects to his pupils. He had a son, whose name does not appear in the work, and three grandsons viz. Durgāprasāda, Chaṇḍidāsa and Devīdāsa. Devīdāsa was the youngest and apparently the most intelligent of the group. He had a scholarly disposition. Having finished his education at home, he went out to Nadia, then the centre of Culture in Eastern India, with the idea of prosecuting higher studies in philosophy. He sat for a long time at the feet of the famous logician Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīśa and became one of his most favourite pupils. It is said that even on the first interview Bhavānanda had been so much struck with his scholarship that he had predicted about his future greatness. He then married and went to Benares, where he became known for his learning under the title of "Vidyābhūṣaṇa". It was here that his son, Rāmakṛṣṇa was born.

About Rāmkṛṣṇa himself Kṛṣṇakānta says little, excepting that he was thoroughly conversant with all the Śāstras, was a great pandit and won wide celebrity. Besides it is added that on the occasion of his marriage Devīdāsa came to Pāṭalī, and settled * there as teacher till the end of his life.

* Kṛṣṇakānta quotes the old popular saying which speaks of 6 (or 7) great contemporary scholars, viz. Jayadeva and Rudranātha at Nadia, Ramānātha at Pūrvasthalī, three Bhūṣaṇas at Pāṭalī and Rāmarāma at Taḍiṭa.

Whether Rāmakṛṣṇa returned to Bengal and settled at Nadia or stayed on at Benares, is not known. But it is certain that his influence travelled far and wide, and was not confined to provincial limits.

Kṛṣṇakānta, Rāma Kṛṣṇa's great grandson, having lived in 1801 A. D. Rāma Kṛṣṇa's time may be assigned* with some probability to the last quarter of the 17th Century.

He wrote

A. Commentaries on

(*a*) Raghunātha Śiromaṇi's

i. Nyāyalīlāvatī dīdhiti

ii. Tattvachintāmaṇi dīdhiti

iii. Guṇa Kiraṇāvalī prakāśa dīdhiti.

and B. (*a*) Nyāyadīpikā

(*b*) Tarkāmṛta

(*c*) A certain number of Vādārthas.

XXV.—MAHĀDEVA BHAṬṬĀCHĀRYA.

There exists in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, a MS of a work named मितभाषिणी which on examination is found to be a gloss on the Nyāya Sūtras of Gotama, attributed in the Colophon† to one

---

* शाके रसाक्षिशैलक्षितिपरिगणिते (Ind. Off. Cat., p. 654, Ms No. 814.)

† इति भट्टाचार्यश्रीमहादेवकृतौ सितभाषिण्यां न्यायवृत्तौ द्वितीयमाह्निकम्।
Fol. 36b.

This clear statement of the authorship should at once dispel the error of Aufrecht (Cat. Cat. I, 437) who ascribes the work, apparently on the similarity of names, to Mahādeva Puntāmkar. The title Bhaṭṭāchārya is a certain indication of the author's Bengali descent. The Nyāya Sūtra Vṛtti is said to have been undertaken at the request of one Someśvara Bhaṭṭa.

Mahādeva Bhaṭṭāchārya. He was the son of Vāgīśvarācārya and Bhāgīrathī. From evidences of style and the method of interpretation I feel strongly inclined to identify this writer with the author of a similar gloss on the Sāṅkhya Sūtras (Sāṅkhyavrittisāra). If this identification be correct Mahādeva had been the pupil of one Svayamprakāśa Tīrtha who conferred on him the title of 'Vedāntin' *.

His time falls in the last quarter of the 17th Century. At the end of his Commentary on विष्णुसहस्रनाम he gives Saṃvat 1750 (खबाणमुनिभूमाने) or 1693 A. D. as the date of its composition :

महादेवोऽकरोद्व्याख्यां विष्णोर्नामसहस्रगाम् ।
खबाणमुनिभूमाने वत्सरे श्रीमुखाभिधे ॥

Weber, Vol. II,. p. 113.

[Cf Garbe's Sāṅkhya Philosophie, p. 78 and Sāṅkhya und Yoga (Grundriss Series), p. 9].

XXVI.—RĀMACHANDRA SIDDHĀNTAVĀGĪŚA.

I noticed a Ms of Rāma Chandra's Commentary on the Chintāmaṇididhiti, Pratyakṣa section, (प्रत्यक्षमणिदीधितिविवेचन) in the family Library of Bābu Dikṣita Jaḍe of Benares. The Ms was incomplete, containing only a few

---

*. See

(i) the Colophon at the end of Berlin MS (636) of his Sānkhyavrittisāra, Chap. I:

इति स्वयंप्रकाशतीर्थाङ्घ्रिलब्धवेदान्तिसत्पदेन महादेवेनोन्नीते सांख्यवृत्तिसारे प्र० अध्यायः ।

Weber, p. 185.

and (ii) the beginning of Berlin MS (1524) of his Commentary on Viṣṇusahasranāma—

स्वयंप्रकाशतीर्थाङ्घ्रिलब्धवेदान्तिसत्पदः ।
महादेवोऽर्थमाचष्टे विष्णुनामसहस्रगम् ॥

Weber, Vol. II. p. 113.

leaves at the end. In the Colophon, which is happily preserved, the author is styled Mahāmahopādhyāya.

XXVII.—ŚRĪKṚISHṆA NYĀYAVĀGĪŚA BHAṬṬACHĀRYA.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa was the son of Govinda Nyāyalaṅkāra and was the author of a Commentary on the Nyāya Siddhānta mañjarī, called भावदीपिका । This Commentary was written, as the author himself intimates in the Colophon, at the instance of one Rājā Bhāva Siṃha, son of Śatruśalya.* No clue is given as to the identity of these kings†.

The author of Navadvīpa Mahimā says (p. 88), without stating any authority, that this Govinda was the descendant of the great Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma and that he was the leading pandit at the Court of Nadia. It is also said that he received 1000 *bighas* of rent-free land in the village of Aḍabāndi.

---

* I inspected a complete, and apparently very old, Ms of this work in the family collection of Bābu Dīkṣita Jaḍe of Benares, where on fol. 139 the following colophon was found :
इति श्रीगोविन्दन्यायालंकारभट्टाचार्यात्मजश्रीकृष्णन्यायवागीशभट्टाचार्य विरचितायां न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जरीटीकायां शब्दखण्डः समाप्तः । शत्रुशल्यतनूजस्य भावसिंहमहीपतेः । आज्ञया रचितो ग्रन्थो भावसिंहनिरीक्षणः ।

May this S'atruśalya be identical with the hero of the poem, S'atruśalya Charita, by one Viśvanātha, son of Nārāyaṇa, which Peterson notices (3. 342) ?

† Rāmanārāyaṇa was the acknowledged head of the Pandit Community of Nadia towards the end of the 18th Century. Among his other pupils was the famous बुनो रामनाथ or Rāmanātha 'the wild'—a nick name won for his dwelling on the outskirts of the village—whose name has become a familiar expression for plain living and high thinking.

XXVIII.—KṚṢṆA KĀNTA VIDYĀVĀGIŚA.

Krişṇa Kānta, the son of Kālîcharaṇa Nyāyālaṅkāra and Tāriṇī Devī and a pupil of Rāmanārāyaṇa Tarkapañchānana† was a Brahmin of the Vaidic class. He flourished towards the end of 18th and beginning of 19th Century—during the reign of Mahārajā Giriśachandra of Krishnagara *

He was the author of

A. Commentaries on

(*a*) Raghunātha's

i. Padārthatattvanirūpaṇa

(*b*) Jagadīśa's

i. Śabda śakti prakāśikā (शक्तिसन्दीपनी).

This work was composed in Śaka 1723 or 1801 A. D.

(*c*) Rāmakṛṣṇa's

i. Tarkāmṛta

B. (*a*) Nyāyaratnāvalī.

---

* cf Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Indian Logic, p. 485.

VII

AN INDEX TO THE PROPER NAMES

OCCURING IN

VĀLMĪKI'S RĀMĀYAṆA

(Based on Bombay and Calcutta Editions)

BY

MANMATHA NATHA RAY, M A.

PREFATORY NOTE.

It is hardly possible to overestimate the value of scientific indexing, especially of works which are considered as forming the basic literature for the cultural study of a nation. From this point of view the Epics and the Purāṇas occupy the foremost position. Much has been done of late in this direction–though more still remains–for the Mahābhārata by such eminent scholars as Hopkins and Sörensen, but the Ramāyaṇa seems to have received but scant attention. The labours of Weber, Jacobi and others in connection with the Rāmāyaṇa, like those of Holtzmann, Dahlmann, etc. for the sister Epic, are indeed laudable, but they cannot render a thorough Indexing (descriptive, nominal and topical) of these works unnecessary.

So far as Nominal Index is concerned Sörensen's work on the Mahābhārata may be taken to be a model. A similar work on the Rāmāyaṇa has long been felt to be a desideratum. Mr. Manmatha nātha Roy, M. A., a Research Scholar of the Govt. Sanskrit College Benares, whom I entrusted with the compilation of an Index of this kind, has just finished his work, and I am glad to introduce it to the public. In the present work the writer has given a descriptive account of all the proper names that occur in the Epic, and in the "Topical Index", which is to follow as a separate work very soon, an attempt has been made to sum up, under specific heads, the entire contents of the Text. It is expected that this will greatly facilitate a closer study of the Rāmāyaṇa.

The numerical references in the Index are to the Bangavasi Edition of the Text of 1308 B. S., corresponding to the Nirnaya Sagar Edition of 1921.

Government Sanskrit College, Benares. } **GOPINATH KAVIRAJ.**

INDEX TO RĀMĀYAṆA

an experienced soldier (IV. 55. 1-4). मेघाभः मेघवर्णः मेघस्वनमहास्वनः (VI. 55. 7). In the battle field never shook even before the Devas (VI. 55. 8). सिंहोपचितस्कन्धः शार्दूलसमविक्रम : (VI. 55. 12). Went out at the head of a large army driving in a chariot and disregarding all sorts of omens (VI. 55. 7-13). Did fearful slaughter in the ranks of the Vānara army (VI. 55. 28). Finding that the Rākṣasa army was being cornered by the Vānaras, drove the chariot that side and wrought havoc in the ranks of the Vānaras (VI. 56. 1-7). रथिनां वरः (VI. 56. 6). Received Hanumān with a shower of arrows (VI. 56. 11). Cut off the hill-top to pieces with which Hanumān attacked him (VI. 56. 18). On finding the havoc wrought by Hanumān in the ranks of the Rākṣasa army (VI. 56. 19-24), shot 14 deadly arrows at him and fought on till struck down dead (VI. 56. 25-30). महात्मा नवोदितार्कोपमताम्रवक्त्रः. Accompanied Rāvaṇa to the battle-field riding on an elephant (VI. 59. 14). Son of Sumālin and Ketu-Matī (VII. 5. 38-39). Overwhelmed in the action against Māndhātā (VII 23 (c). 34). Accompanied Sumālin to fight against the Devas (VII. 27. 28,).

AKOPA—A counsellor of Daśaratha (I. 7. 3).

AKṢA—A Rākṣasa, roughly handled by Hanumān (I. 1. 75). Rāvaṇa's son. Went out to fight with Hanumān at thedesire of Rāvaṇa. Fought withHanumān, but was killed at the end. (V. 47.1–36). समरोद्धतोन्मुखः (V. 47. 1). प्रतापवान् काञ्चनचित्रकार्मुकः (V. 47. 2). वीर्यवान् नैर्ऋतर्षभः (V. 47. 3). अमरतुल्यविक्रमः (V. 47. 6). हरीक्षणः (V. 47. 8 . समाहितात्मा (V. 47. 10). आशुपराक्रमः (V. 47. 12). समाधिसंयोगविमोक्षतत्त्वविद् (V. 47. 14). रणचण्डविक्रमः प्रवृद्धतेजोबलवीर्यसायकः (V. 47. 19). वीर्यदर्पितः क्षतजोपमेक्षणः (V.47.20). रथिश्रेष्ठतरः (V. 47. 22).

AGASTYA—A Ṛṣi who with his brother dwelt in the Daṇḍaka forests. Rāma during his exile paid a visit to them. Directed by him, Rāma came in possession of certain divine weapons (I. 1. 42—43). Rāma's visit to him foreseen by Vālmīki (I. 3. 19). Sunda having been killed by him, Tāṭakā and her son, Mārīca rushed at him, but he changed them into Rākṣasas. ऋषिसत्तमः, भगवान् ऋषिः (I. 25. 10—13).

On the eve of his banishment, Rāma instructed Lakṣmaṇa to send valuable presents and some cows to him. ब्राह्मणोत्तमः (II. 32. 13—14).

मुनिसत्तमः (III. 11. 30). महर्षिः धीमान् (III. 11. 32). महामुनिः (III. 11. 37). With a desire to do good to humanity, cleared the Southern regions of demons (III. 11. 54). At the request of the Devas, ate away Vātāpi, the Asura, and reduced to ashes his brother, Ilvala (III. 11. 55—67). द्विजेन्द्रः दीप्ततेजाः (III. 11. 66). His hermitage described (III. 11. 73—76; 79—80; 86; 89—93). Made the Southern regions habitable by destroying the Rākṣasas (III. 11. 81—84). Stopped the growth of the Vindhya hills (III. 11. 85). स्वेनैव कर्मणा लोके विख्यातः (III. 11. 79). पुण्यकर्मा (III. 11. 81.). दीर्घायुः (III. 11. 86). लोके विश्रुतकर्मा (III. 11. 86). लोके र्चितः साधुः सतां हिते नित्यं रतः (III. 11. 87). The disciple, instructed by Lakṣmaṇa (III. 12. 1—4) entered the fire-temple and announced the arrival of Rāma (III. 12. 5—9). मुनिश्रेष्ठः तपसा दुष्प्रधर्षणः (III. 12. 6). Instantly asked him to show them in (III. 12. 9—12). Appeared before Rāma etc. surrounded by disciples (III. 12. 21). भगवान्, तपसां निधानः (III. 12. 23). Saluted by Rāma etc. (III. 12. 24) offered them seats, and received them formally (III. 12. 26—7). Honored Rāma separately, for he was the king as well as a guest (III. 12. 28—30), and presented him with divine weapons (III. 12. 31—37). Praised highly the womanly qualities of Sītā, and the loyalty of Lakṣmaṇa (III.

22

13. 1—8). अनल इव दीप्तः (III. 13. 9). In reply to Rāma's enquiry (III. 13. 10—11) suggested the name of Pañcavaṭī ; then described the route (III. 13. 12—22). सत्यवादी. Gave leave to Rāma etc. to depart (III. 13. 23—24). भावितात्मा (III. 15. 12). Congratulated Rāma on the destruction of Khara, and explained to him the mystery of Indra's visit to the hermitage of Śara-bhaṅga (III. 30. 34—37). His annihilation of Vātāpi referred to (III. 43. 42—44).

Lived near the Malaya hills. आदित्यसंकाशः ऋषिसत्तमः महात्मा ; Sugrīva instructed Aṅgada and others to propitiate him before proceeding further in quest of Sītā (IV. 41. 15—16). Placed the Mahendra hills in the bosom of the sea (IV. 41. 20). Viśva-karmā built a mansion for him on the heights of the Kuñjara Hills (IV. 41. 34—36). Guardian deity of the South (IV. 45. 6).

Appeared before Rāma on the eve of his final struggle with Rāvaṇa, and communicated to him the victory-yielding स्तव addressed to the Sun, and advised him to repeat it thrice before fighting with him (VI. 105. 1-27). His cultural conquest of the South referred to by Rāma (VI. 115. 14).

Came to congratulate Rāma on his return home (VII.1.3). Requested the porter to inform Rāma that the Ṛṣis were waiting outside (VII. 1. 8-9). At the request of Rāma (VII. 1. 29—36), proceeded to narrate the life-history of Indrajit. (VII. 2—30). कुम्भयोनिः (VII. 2. 1) ; (VII. 37 (b). 5). त्रेताग्निसमविग्रहः (VII. 4. 2). In reply to Rāma's query (VII.4.1-7), described the history of the early Rākṣasa settlers of Laṅkā (VII. 4—8). In reply to Rāma's question (VII. 10. 1), described the austerities practised by Rāvaṇa etc. (VII. 10. 2—49). In reply to Rāma's query (VII. 23(e). 66—67), said that the island-man was the Lord, Kapila, and the 30 crores were the reflections of his Great Soul (VIII. 23 (e).

67—70). In reply to Rāma's enquiry (VII. 31. 1–4), described Rāvaṇa's discomfitures (VII. 31. 5—34, 44). In reply to Rama's query (VII. 35. 1–13) proceeded to describe how on account of an imprecation, Hanumān was not conscious of his strength (VII 35. 14—36, 49.). Asked for permission to retire (VII. 36. 51). Accepting Rāma's invitation, withdrew (VII. 36. 58–59). At the request of Rāma (VII. 37(a). 1—3), narrated the birth of Ṛkṣa-rāṭ, Vālin and Sugrīva (VII. 37(a). 3—59). Explained why Rāvaṇa had abducted Sitā (VII. 37(b). 5—37(c). 28) in the words of Nārada (VII. 37(d). 1—9). Described the disconfiture of Rāvaṇa at the hands of women of Śveta-dvīpa (VII. 37(e) 1—55). Retired (VII. 37 (e). 61). Born of a pot in which Mitra and Varuṇa had deposited their energy; retreated soon after, saying to Mitra, "I am not your son." तेजोमयः, विप्रः, ऋषिसत्तमः (VII. 57. 4—5). Received the Devas warmly and honored them equally (VII. 76. 21). Receiving Rāma duly, congratulated him for having restored the Brāhmaṇa's child to life, and offered to make a gift of a few ornaments to him (VII. 76. 25—33). In reply to Rāma's query (VII. 76. 33—36), proceeded to narrate an anecdote of the Tretā Age (VII. 76. 36). How he had seen a heavenly being feeding on a corpse in a lonely forest, and how out of curiosity he enquired why he ate such impure things (VII. 77. 1—20). Moved to hear Śveta's sad story (VII. 78. 1–25), accepted his gifts, thus paving his way to heaven (VII. 78. 26–29). In compliance with Rāma's wish (VII. 79. 1–3), described the story of Rājā Daṇḍa (VII. 79. 4—81. 20). As the evening came on, advised Rāma to say his evening prayers (VII. 81. 21—22). धर्मनेत्रः (VII. 82. 8). In reply to Rāma's application (VII. 82. 5—7) granted him permission to depart (VII. 82. 8—13). सत्यशीलः (VII. 82. 14).

AGASTYA'S BROTHER—Lived at the distance of 4 Yojanas to the south of Sutīkṣṇa's hermitage (III. 11. 37). His hermitage described by Rāma (III. 11. 47-53). Rāma etc. on their way to Agastya's place broke their journey for a night there (III. 11. 69-70). Next morning with his permission left for Agastya's hermitage (III. 11. 71-73.)

AGNI—At the desire of Brahman produced Nila (I. 17. 13). On being vanquished by Bali waited on Viṣṇu (I. 29. 6). Requested by the Devas petrified the discharged energy of Mahādeva (I. 36. 17). Waited on Brahman along with other Devas to obtain a commander-in-chief (I. 37. 1-2). Referred to by Brahman to be the one who could bring about the birth of the commander of gods (I. 37. 7). Deputed by the Devas to bring about the birth of a son by depositing the energy of Mahādeva in Gaṅgā (I. 37. 10-11). हुताशनः (I. 37. 11). पावकः (I. 37. 12). Went to Gaṅgā and asked her to bear the child to please the Devas (I. 37. 12). Gaṅgā being ready (I. 37.13) saturated her through and through (I. 37.14). Gaṅgā pleading inablliity (I. 37.15) directed her to deposit the foetus by the side of the Himavān (I. 37. 17). सर्वदेवपुरोगमः (I. 37. 15). Elected Kārtikeya commander-in-chief of the divine army (I. 37. 30). Requested by Indra to get his testicles restored (I. 49. 1), approached the Pitṛs for remedy (I. 49. 5). Became nervous when Viśvāmitra wanted to hurl the Brahma weapon at Vasiṣṭha (I. 56. 14). His protection invoked by Kauśalyā on the eve of Rāma's exile (II. 25. 24). Agitated at the austerities of Maṇḍa-karṇi sent five Apsarās to create mischief (III. 11. 13-15). Greeted by Sītā on the appearance of Hanumān as Rāma's messenger (V. 32. 14). His temple at Agastya's hermitage visited by Rāma (III. 12. 17). His protection invoked by Sītā in favour of Hanumān (V. 53. 25-28). Begot Sannādana on a Gandharva girl. कृष्णवर्त्मन (VI. 27. 20). Came out of the

fire placing Sītā on the lap and testifying to her spotless character, and advised Rāma to accept her as his wife (VI. 118. 1-10). लोकस्य साक्षी (VI. 118. 5). On the destruction of Lavaṇa (VII. 69.36) appeared before Śatrughna ready to grant boons (VII.70 1-3). Disappeared after granting him the boon (VII. 70.6-7). Congratulated Rāma on the death of Śambūka (VII.76. 5-6). On the flight of Indra (VII. 85. 15-16), approached Viṣṇu (VII. 85. 17). Paid his respects to Viṣṇu (VII. 110. 13).

AGNI-KETU—A Rākṣasa chief who in Rāvaṇa's court stood ready with his arms to kill Rāma etc. (VI. 9. 2). fought wirh Rāma. (VI. 43. 11). Killed by Rāma. (VI. 43. 26. 27). दुर्धर्षः (Ibid).

AGNI-VARṆA–Son of Sudarśana and father of Śīghra-ga. (I. 70. 40—41).

AṆGAS, THE—Ruled over by Roma-pāda (I. 9. 8). Stricken with drought (I. 9. 9). So called, because Kandarpa when reduced to ashes by Mahā Deva, cast off his body (अङ्गम्) here (I. 23. 10—14). Daśaratha offered the produce of——to appease the wrath of Kaikeyī. II. 11. 37—38). Sugrīva asked Vinata to go there in quest of Sītā (IV. 4o. 23).

AṄGADA—Son of Vālin and Tārā, the Crown-Prince. While he went into the forests, the spies informed him about the alliance between Sugrīva and Rāma. This fact he reported to Tārā (IV. 15. 15—18). गुणज्येष्ठः कनकांगदः (IV. 18. 50). बालः अकृतबुद्धिः एकपुत्रः मे प्रियः (IV. 18. 52) Vālin on his death-bed asks Rāma to take care of him (IV. 18. 50—53). वीरः सुकुमारः सुखोचितः (IV. 20. 17). प्रियचारुवेषः (20. 24). Sugrīva asked by the dying Vālin to take care of him on his death (IV. 22. 8—15). सुग्रीवस्य तुल्यपराक्रमः (IV. 22. 11). तेजस्वी तरुणः (IV. 22. 12). Advised by his dying father

to follow the wishes of Sugrīva (IV. 22. 20—23). पिङ्गाक्षः (IV. 23. 22). Asked by his mother touched the feet of the dead Vālin repeating his name (IV. 23. 22—25). सुजनः सुवश्यः (IV. 24. 20). Asked by Lakṣmaṇa to bring garlands, cloths, oil, ghee etc. (IV. 25. 16). Helped Sugrīva in placing the corpse of Vālin in the palanquin (IV. 25. 28). Embraced by the weeping Tārā and other ladies of the harem (IV. 25. 33—34). With a heavy heart placed the dead body of his father on the pyre, set fire to it and walked solemnly round it and then along with others performed the तर्पण ceremony (IV. 25. 49—53). वीरः (IV. 26. 12). ज्येष्ठः सदृशः विक्रमेण च अदीनात्मा (IV. 26. 13). Appointed yuvarāja by Sugrīva at the desire of Rāma (IV. 38). Became perturbed at seeing Lakṣmaṇa advancing towards him angrily (IV. 31. 31). At Lakṣmaṇa's request (IV. 31. 32—34), hurried to announce him (IV. 31. 35). संभ्रान्तभावः परदीनवक्त्रः तरस्वी Did so after saluting Rāma, Tārā and Sugrīva (IV. 31. 36—37). Lakṣmaṇa passed by his well-furnished house in Kiṣkindhā (IV. 33. 9). Joined Sugrīva with 1000 Padmas and 100 Śaṅkhas of Vānaras (IV. 39. 29. 30). Sugrīva appointed him as the general of the contingent going to the South in search of Sītā (IV. 45. 6). Accompanied Hanumān to the south (IV. 48. 1). Searched the Vindhyas for nothing (IV. 48. 2—6). Killed a mighty Asura in the water-less and tree-less tract (IV. 48. 7—23). Finding his companions dispirited, proposed that they should once more ransack the southern parts in search of Sītā for fear of Sugrīva and Rāma (IV. 49. 1—10). महाप्राज्ञः (IV. 49. 1). Once more searched in vain the Vindhya forests and the Rajata hills till overtaken with fatigue (IV. 49. 15—23). Having ransacked the Vindhyas, entered the Ṛkṣa cave in search of water (IV. 50. 1—8). सिंहर्षभस्कन्धः पीनायतभुजः (IV.

53. 7). When coming out of Ṛkṣa cave he discovered that the time allotted by Sugrīva was already past, proposed to die of starvation on the sea-side as Sugrīva would never tolerate the failure of the expedition (IV. 53. 7—19).

बुद्ध्या ह्यष्टांगया युक्तः चतुर्बलसमन्वितः चतुर्दशगुणः तेजो-बलपराक्रमैः शश्वच्च आपूर्यमाणः श्रिया शुक्लपक्षादौ वर्धमानः शशीव बुद्ध्या बृहस्पतिसमः विक्रमे पितुः सदृशः (IV. 54. 2-4). Vehemently condemned the faults of Sugrīva and along with his companions undertook to die of starvation (IV. 55. 1—23). On finding Sampāti drawing towards them bemoaned their lot and praised Jaṭāyus for his whole-hearted devotion to Rāma's cause (IV. 56. 6—16). In reply to Sampāti's enquiries introduced himself, described the death of Jaṭāyus and the circumstances that had led the Vānaras to take to fasting (IV. 57. 4—19). Anxiously asked Sampāti to direct the Vānaras to Rāvaṇa's place of refuge (IV. 58. 8—10). Finding his followers dejected at the sight of the roaring sea tried to rouse their courage (IV. 64. 8—10). Next day, held again a council and asked the Vānaras who could save their lives and limbs from being destroyed by Sugrīva, by leaping across the sea, to come forward (IV. 64. 11—19). When everyone kept quiet, exhorted them to speak out (IV. 64. 20—22). Told in the council that he could certainly jump a hundred yojanas but was not sanguine if he could return (IV. 65. 18—19). सत्यविक्रमः परन्तपः (IV. 65. 26). In reply to Jāmbavān's contention that he must allow his servants to try the game first (IV. 65. 20—27), said that if nobody was ready to go then they should once more take to fasting ; for they could not return home without having located the whereabouts of Sītā (IV. 65. 28—32). On the return of Hanumān paid him high compliments (V. 57. 44—48). Sat down on the Mahendra hills along with Hanumān, surrounded by the Vānaras (V.

57. 49—53). After Hanumān's speech (V. 59. 1—32) proposed to release Sītā by vanquishing the Rākṣasas without giving any previous information to Rāma and Sugrīva (V. 60. 1—13). Approving the proposal of Jāmbavān (V. 60. 14—20) took his way home (V. 61. 1—2). Gave permission to his companions to drink honey of the Madhu-vana, when they prayed for it (V. 61. 11—12). धीमान् (V. 61. 13). Gave free license to the Vānaras to drink (V. 62. 2—4). On hearing the message delivered by Dadhi-mukha (V. 64. 1—12) proposed that they should go to Sugrīva without delay (V. 64. 12—17). His proposal having been approved (V. 64. 18—22.) went to Sugrīva by the aerial route followed by the Vānaras (V. 64. 23—26). Approached Sugrīva leading the party of Vānaras and then bowed to Sugrīva and Rāma (V. 64. 40—41). Carried Lakṣmaṇa on his shoulders during his expeditionary march to the South (VI. 4. 19). In reply to Rāma's request (VI. 17. 31—33) suggested that they should examine well Bibhīṣaṇa before taking him in (VI.17. 38—4). मतिमान् (VI.17.38). Guessed that Śuka was a spy and as such he should be confined (VI. 20. 29—30). Placed in charge of the centre of the invading army (उरसि) VI.24.14). गिरिशृंगप्रतीकाशः पद्मकिंजल्कसंनिभः (VI 26.15). Son of Indra (VI.30.24). Was to lead the attack against the southern gate defended by Mahodara and Mahā Pārśva (VI.37.27). Pursuant to Rāma's order entered Laṅkā and presented the ultimatum to Rāvaṇa in open court on behalf of Rāma. (VI 41.73—81). आत्मवान् (VI.41.85). Hearing the command of Rāvaṇa (VI.73.82—83), allowed the Rākṣasas to capture him; when they had done so he leaped up along with his captors, then demolishing the pinnacle of Rāvaṇa's place, returned to his own camp by the aerial route (VI.41. 84—91). Fought a duel with Indrajit (VI.43.6). Smashed to pieces the chariot of Indrajit with his club (VI.43.19). Dismounted Indrajit by destroying his chariot and the

driver, hence applauded by the Devas and the sages (VI.44. 28—29). At Rāma's desire went up (VI.45.1—3) to discover the position taken up by Indrajit, but foiled (VI.45. 4—5). Repaired where Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa were lying senseless (VI.46.3). Wounded by Indrajit (VI.46.21). Carefully guarded the Vānara army (VI 47.2—4). In reply to Sugrīva's query (VI.50.1) told him that the cause of the flight of the Vānaras was the condition of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (VI.50.2—3). Finding that the Rākṣasas under Yajña-danṣṭra were creating a havoc in the Vānara army, annihilated the Rākṣasas (VI.53.27—32). Finding the Vānara army hard pressed by Vajra-danṣṭra, fought a contested duel with Vajradaṃṣṭra—in the course of which he un-charioted him, exchanged fists and fought with broad sword and shield, till he killed his opponent (VI.54.16—37). Killed Kumbha-hanū (VI. 58. 23). Guarded the gate at the desire of Rāma (VI.61.37). Finding the Vānara chiefs panic-striken at sight of Kumbha-karṇa (VI.66.3) tried to rouse their spirit by delivering a harangue (VI. 66. 4—7). Finding the Vānara army flying in disorder once more rallied it delivering a harangue (VI. 66. 18—32). Fought a duel with Kumbha-karṇa till stunned by a blow fell down (VI.67.42—49). वज्रहस्तात्मजात्मजः (VI. 67. 42). युद्धमार्गविशारदः (VI. 67. 47). In obedience to Sugrīva's order (VI.69.81—82) fought a duel with Narāntaka and killed him with his horse (VI.69.83—94). Congratulated by the Devas, became gratified with his achievement (VI. 69, 95—96). Simultaneously attacked by Devāntaka, Triśirā Mahodara (VI. 70. 1—4), bravely defended himself till rescued by Nīla and Hanūmān (VI. 70. 5—20). Wounded by Indrajit (VI.73.45). Fought a duel with Kampana and killed him (VI. 76. 1—3). Fought with Śoṇitākṣa, broke to pieces his bow, then snatching away his sword mortally wounded him (VI. 76. 4—10). Fought single handed

with Prajaṅgha, Yūrpākṣa and Śoṇitākṣa (VI. 76. 14—15). Killed Prajaṅgha in a duel (VI. 76. 18.—27). Fought a duel with Kumbha but was badly wounded (VI. 76. 46—55). Joined Lakṣmaṇa while he went to fight against Indra-jit (VI. 85. 35). Fought a duel with Mahā-Pārśva when his army was hard pressed and at last killed him (VI.98.1—22). Greeted Rāma on the death of Rāvaṇa (VI. 108. 33). Received costly अङ्गद्s on the occasion of Rāma's coronation (VI. 128. 77). Caressed and honored by Rāma (VII. 39. 16—19). Succeeded Sugrîva in Kiṣkindhā (VII. 108. 22).

AṄGADA—Son of Lakṣmaṇa. धर्मविशारदः दृढविक्रमः (VII. 102. 2). Made King of Kārupatha (VII. 102. 11).

AṄGADĪYĀ—Capital of Kārupatha, ruled over by Aṅgada. Founded by Rāma. रम्या पुरी, रमणीया, सुगुप्ता (VII. 102. 8).

AṄGA—LEPĀ—A town of the West. Sugrīva sent Suṣena etc. there in search of Sītā (IV. 42. 14).

AṄGĀRAKA—A Rākṣasî of the Southern Seas who drew her victims by means of their shadows (IV. 41. 26). Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to search carefully these places for Sītā (IV. 41. 27).

AṄGIRASA—A Prajāpati who came after Pulastya (III. 14. 8).

His descendants cursed Hanūmān for creating mischief in the hermitage (VII. 36. 32—34). Invited to a sacrificial session convened by Rājā Nimi (VII. 55. 9).

AJA—Son of Nābhāga, and father of Daśaratha (I. 70. 43).

AÑJANA, THE—Hills. Sugrīva asked Hanūmān to send for the Vānaras living there (IV. 37. 5). 3 krores came thence (IV. 37. 20).

AÑJANA—A regional elephant (VII. 31. 36).

AÑJANĀ—अप्सरसां श्रेष्ठा, विख्याता अप्सरा, alias पुञ्जिकस्थला wife of the Vānara chief Kesarī विख्याता त्रिषु लोकेषु रूपेणाप्रतिमा भुवि, कामरूपिणी। On account of a curse was born as the daughter of the Vānara chief Kuñjara. One day while she was loitering about on the hills in the form of a human being, Vāyu stripped her naked and had an intercourse with her in mind. Hanumān was the child of this union. She safely delivered him in a lonely cave (IV. 66. 8—20). Raped by Rāvaṇa while on her way to Brahman's place (VI. 13. 11—12). Hence cursed Rāvaṇa (VI. 60. 11). Daughter of Varuṇa (Ibid). Wife of Kesarī gave birth to Hanūmān.

ATI-KĀYA—अतिविवृद्धकायः, विन्ध्यास्तमहेन्द्रकल्पः, धन्वी, अतिरथः, अतिवीरः Accompanied Rāvaṇa to the battle-field twanging his bow (VI. 59. 16). Nephew of Kumbha-karṇa who mourned the loss of his uncle (VI. 68. 7). On hearing the words of Tri-śirā (VI. 69. 1—7), offered to go to the battle-field (VI. 69. 9). शक्रतुल्यपराक्रमः, वीरः, अन्तरिक्षगतः, मायाविशारदः, त्रिदशदर्पघ्नः, समरदुर्मदः, सुबलसम्पन्नः, विस्तीर्णकीर्तिः, never suffered a defeat, अस्त्रवित्, युद्धविशारदः, प्रवरविज्ञानः, लब्धवरः, शत्रुबलार्दनः, भास्करतुल्यदर्शनः (VI. 69. 10—14). Son of Rāvaṇa, went to the battle-field taking leave of Rāvaṇa (VI. 69. 17—19). अतितेजस्वी drove in an armoured car, well-armed and surrounded by numerous warriors (VI. 69. 25—28). ब्रह्मदत्तवरः, अद्रिसंकाशः, देवदानवदर्पहा (VI. 71. 3). When all his companions were killed got angry and made a rush at the Vānara army putting them to flight (VI. 71. 1—9). हरिलोचनः driving in a chariot drawn by a thousand horses (VI. 71. 12). The car protected by armours, held a great bow and sharp arrows in his hands, with two broad-swords hanging on either side. रक्तकण्ठगुणः, घोरः, महापर्वतसंनिभः

(VI. 71. 12.—24). वृद्धसेवी श्रुतबलः सर्वास्त्रविदुषां वरः (VI. 71. 28). अश्वपृष्ठे नागपृष्ठे खड्गे धनुषि कर्षणे। भेदे सान्त्वे च दाने च नये मन्त्रे च सम्मतः (VI. 71. 29). Son of Dhānya Mālinī and Rāvaṇa (VI. 71. 30). By means of asceticism so far pleased Brahman that he presented him with weapons, divine armours and a shining car (VI. 31—32). Vanquished hundreds of Devas and Dānavas including Indra and Varuṇa (VI. 71. 33—34). Twanging his bow plunged into the thick of the Vānara army; then defeating Dvivida Mainda etc. challenged the heroes alone to come and fight with him (VI. 71. 37—45). Seeing Lakṣmaṇa standing before him (VI. 71. 46—49), ironically advised him to stand back as he did not care to fight with boys (VI. 71. 50—56). Fought a hard contested duel with Lakṣmaṇa but killed (VI. 766—105). Accompanied Sumātī to the battle-field to fight against the Devas (VII. 27. 31).

ATI-MUKHA—A Vānara chief, created by gods to help Rāma (VII. 36. 48).

ATRI—Rāma in exile went to his hermitage from Chitrakūṭa accompanied by Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā. Received them like his own children महायशाः भगवान् (II. 117. 5). Looked after the arrangements of hospitality personally and received courteously Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā (II. 117. 6). Asked the ascetic's wife Anasūyā to take care of Sita. ऋषिसत्तमः (II. 117. 8). धर्मज्ञः सर्वभूतहिते रतः (II. 117. 7). In glowing terms introduced Anasūyā to Rāma and asked Sītā to approach her (II. 117. 9—13). कुलपतिः सूर्यवैश्वानरोपमः (VI. 123. 48). Went from the south to great Rāma on his return home (VII. 1. 3). Invited by Rāja Nimi to act as a priest in a sacrificial session (VII. 55. 9).

ATRI—A great sage of the north who came to greet Rāma on his return home (VII. 1. 5).

ADITI—Gave birth to Indra (I. 18. 12). Wife of Kaśyapa, practised austerities for 1000 years (I. 29. 10—11). Viṣṇu born as Vāmana from her (I. 29. 19). The mother of the Devas (I. 45. 38). Prayed for the success of Indra while he was fighting with the Asuras (II. 25. 34). Daughter of Dakṣa (III. 14. 10). By favor of her husband, became the mother of 33 Vedic deities (III. 14. 13—15) (VII. 11. 15).

ANARANYA महातेजाः, प्रतापवान् Son of Bāṇa and father of Prithu (I. 70. 23—24). Predicted root-and branch destruction of Rāvaṇa's family at the hands of one of his descendants (Rāma) (VI. 60. 8—10). Accepting the challenge of Rāvaṇa (VII. 19. 7—8) fought with him, but was defeated and killed, and with his last breath pronounced the curse (VII. 19. 9—32).

ANALA—A Rākṣasa follower of Bibhīṣaṇa who assuming the form of a bird spied the defence organisation and fighting strength of the Rākṣasas (VI. 37. 7—19). Son of Māli and Vasudā (VII. 5. 41—43).

ANALĀ—A daughter of Dakṣa and wife of Kaśyapa (III. 14 10-12) gave birth to all the fruit bearing trees (III. 14. 31).

ANALĀ—A Rākṣasī, daughter of Mālyavān and Sundarī (VII. 5. 34—36). Wife of Viśvāvasu and mother of Kumbhīnasa (VII. 61. 16).

ANAṄGA—A Vānara chief, son of Agni (हुताशन); Sugrīva wanted to send him to the South in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 4).

ANANTA DEVA—सर्वदेवनमस्कृतः, सहस्रशिराः, नीलवासाः। Dwelt at the top of the Jāta-rūpa-śila hills (IV. 40. 52), towards the east of whose golden altar there was a three-leaved palm tree planted by the gods (IV. 40. 53—54).

ANILA—Son of Māli and Vasudā and a counsellor of Bibhīṣaṇa (VII. 5. 41-43).

ANASŪYÂ—Her presentation of ornaments to and conversation with Sītā-foreseen by Vālmīki (I. 3. 18).

Wife of the saga Atri, वृद्धा, सत्कृता (II. 117. 7). महाभागा, तापसी, धर्मचारिणी (II. 117. 8). Asked by Atri to take away Sītā (II. 117. 8). Introduced to Rāma by Atri (II. 117. 9-12). During a ten years' drought saved the lives of the people by diverting the course of the Gaṅgā, thus helping the fruits and roots to grow; practised penances for 10,000 years and extended the length of one night to ocver the period of ten nights by the might of her asceticism (II. 117. 9-12). सर्वभूतानां नमस्कार्या, अक्रोधना (II. 113. 13). शिथिला, वलिता वृद्धा, जरापाण्डुरमूर्धजा, सततं वेपमानांगी (II. 117. 18). Saluted by Sīta. पतिव्रता (II. 117. 19). Courteously received Sītā and congratulated her for her extreme devotion to Rāma under all conditions (II. 117. 21-29). Being extremely pleased with Sītā for her fine sense of duty offered to grant her a boon (II. 118. 13-15). Overjoyed at her selflessness, presented her with an ever-green garland, anointment and unguent etc. (II. 118. 17-20). When Sītā began to praise her profusely, in order to change the topic asked her to describe her marriage ceremony (II. 118. 23-25). दृढव्रता (II. 118. 23). Extremely delighted at the story, at evening fall permitted her to go to Rāma. At the same time requested her to put on the dresses and paints presented by her (II. 119. 1-11). Saluted by Sītā before she left her (II. 119. 12).

ANUHLĀDA.—A Dānava who abducted Śacī deceitfully. Killed by Indra for this offence (IV. 39-6-7).

ANDHRA.—A country in the South. Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 41-12).

ANDHAKA.—Name of a Daitya killed by Rudra in Śvetāraṇya (III. 30. 27) (VI. 43. 6).

APARA-PARVATA.—Name of a hill traversed by Bharata on his way back from Kekaya (II. 71. 3).

APSARAS, THE.—Annihilated by Rāvaṇa while playing in the groves of the Nandana (I. 15. 23). Praised Viṣṇu when their prayer (I. 15. 19. 26) was granted। (I. 15. 32). The Devas were instructed to produce Vānaras on them (I. 17. 5). Danced merrily on the birth of Rāvaṇa etc. (I. 16. 17). Followed the course of Gaṅgā (I. 43. 32). 6 crores along with numerous maidens churned up from the sea. वरस्त्रियः। Being claimed neither by the Devas, nor by the Dānavas, they became public property (I, 45. 32-35). Were pleased at the expiation of Ahalyā's sin (I. 49. 19). Danced on the occasion of Rāma's marriage (I. 73. 38). Assembled to witness the contest between Rāma and Paraśurāma (I. 76. 10). Requested by Bharadvāja (II. 91. 16) entertained the retinue of Bharata (II. 91. 26). 20,000 came from the Nandana Park in response to his prayer (II. 91. 45). Five deputed by the Devas to disturb the ascetic virtues of the Ṛṣi Māṇḍa Karṇi विद्युच्चलितवर्चसः (III. 11. 15). They won the Ṛṣi's heart and lived under waters of the Pañcāpsara tank, as his wives (III. 11. 11-19). दिव्याभरणमाल्याः दिव्यरूपाः क्रीड़ारतविधिज्ञाः (III. 35. 16). उच्चावचताम्रचूड़ाः विचित्रवेशाः (IV. 24 34).

Haunted the Lake Sudarśana for the sake of pleasure (IV. 40. 46). Haunted the Mahendra Hills (IV. 41. 22). Haunted the lake on the Kailāsa hills near Kuvera's mansions (IV. 43. 22). Lived permanently in the Kṣīroda Sea (IV. 46. 15). Went into raptures when Indrajit was killed (VI. 90. 75). Danced with joy (VI. 90. 85). Witnessed the wonderful combat between Rāma and Rāvaṇa (VI. 107. 51). Danced on the occasion of Rāma's coronation (VI. 128. 71).

Used to disturb Pulastya by visiting the hermitage of Tṛṇabindu (VII. 2. 9. 12). But made themselves scarce when he pronounced a curse on them (VII. 2. 13-14). Frequent the banks of the Mandākinī (VII. 11. 42). Sang sweetly in Kuvera's mansion (VII. 26. 9). Sang for joy when Indra went out to fight Rāvaṇa (VII. 28. 26). Visit the Vindhyas along with their womenfolk. (VII. 31. 16). Greatly disconcerted at the discomfiture of Śatrughna (VII. 69. 13), When Śatrughna drew out the divine arrow to kill Lavaṇa (VII. 69. 16-19), losing the balance of mind approached Brahman (VII. 69. 20-21). On the destruction of Lavaṇa (VII. 69. 36), breathed freely (VII. 69. 39). Showered flowers on Lakṣmaṇa (VII. 106. 16). Crowded the bank of the Sarayū (VII. 110. 7). Expressed their joy on the return of Viṣṇu (VII. 110. 14).

ABHIKĀLA.—A village on the way to Kekaya passed by Vasiṣṭha's messengers (II. 68. 17).

AMARĀVATĪ.— The residential town of Indra (III. 48. 10).

AMṚTA.—Sought after by the Devas and the Dānavas as the sovereign remedy against death and decay (I.45.16). Obtained by churning the Kṣīroda Sea (I. 45. 17—18). On being produced the Devas and the Dānavas fell out for possession (I. 45. 40). Removed by Viṣṇu (I. 45. 42). Sampāti lived in the times when it was churned out (IV. 58. 13). Churned out of the sea into which the Vānaras had thrown medicinal herbs (IV. 66. 13). Produced from the milk of Surabhi (VII.23.23).

AMBARĪṢA—King of Ayodhyā. His sacrifice interrupted because of the thift of the horse by Indra (I. 61.5.—6). The priests asked him to substitute a human being for the lost animal (I. 61. 6—8). पुरुषर्षभः (I. 61. 9). महाबुद्धिः Roamed about for a human victim (I.61.9—10).

At last came across Ṛcīka who dwelt in Bhṛgutuṅga, with his wife and three children (I. 61. 11—15). The father and the mother refusing to sell the eldest and the youngest sons respectively, bought Śunahśepa for a large sum of money (I.61.16—23). राजर्षिः, महातेजाः, महायशाः (I. 61. 24). Started for Ayodhyā with the victim in a chariot (I.61.24). Broke his journey at Puṣkara one noon (I.62.1). राजसिंहः (I.62.21). Returned soon to the sacrificial area and completed the sacrifice by favor of Indra (I.62.23—27). Son of Praśuśruka and father of Nahuṣa (I.70.41—42).

AYODHYĀ.—Rāma went to—(I. 1. 86). Rāma's journey foreseen by Vālmīki (I. 3. 37). Described in detail (I. 5. 5—23). Inhabitants (I. 5. 6—19). Defences (I.6.21—28). Public reception accorded to Daśaratha and Ṛṣyaśṛṅga (I. 11. 25—27). Festivities at—on the birth of Rāma etc. (I.18.18—20). The messengers sent by Janaka arrived at—(I. 68. 1). Public reception of the newly-married princes (I. 77. 6—8). Richly decorated on the occasion of Rāma's consecration (II. 5. 15—21; 6. 11—19). Shook when Rāma went into exile (II. 41. 12; 20). Its miserable appearance (II. 42. 23). Fondly remembered by Rāma (II 46. 4). Ceased to be beautiful when Rāma left it (II. 47. 17—18); (II. 48. 34--37). Rāma took leave of—(II.50.1—3). अनुरक्तजनाकीर्णा, सुखालोकप्रियावहा (II. 51. 16). Described (II. 51. 21—23). Gloomy appearance described by Sumantra (II. 59. 10—16). Its deserted appearance described by Bharata (II.71.18—29; 37—43). Unprotected as the town was, still defended by the might of Rāma (II. 88. 23—25). Rāma's anxious enquiries about the well-being of the city to Bharata (II. 100. 40—42). Bharata returns from Citra-kūṭa to—(II. 113. 23). Its deserted appearance described (II. 114. 2—29). शुभा

(III.62.15). Remembered by the exiled Rāma (IV.28.56). Return of Rāma. Saluted by the Vānaras and the Rākṣasas. पाण्डुरहर्म्यमालिना, विशालकक्ष्या, गजवाजिभिर्वृता (VI. 123. 52—54). Deserted on the departure of Rāma, once more flourished at the time of Ṛṣabha (VII. 111. 10).

AYO-MUKHA—The Hills in the South. धातुमण्डितः, विचित्रशिखरः, श्रीमान्, चित्रपुष्पितकाननः, सुचन्दनवनोद्देशः। Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 13-14).

AYO-MUKHĪ—महारूपा, राक्षसी, विकृतानना (III. 69. 11). अल्पसत्त्वानां भयदा, बीभत्सा, रौद्रदर्शना, लम्बोदरी, तीक्ष्ण-दंष्ट्रा, कराली, परुषत्वक् (III. 69. 12). विकटा, मुक्तमूर्धजा, devouring fierce stags (III. 69. 13). Seen by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa near the fissure in the vicinity of the hermitage of Mataṅga (III. 69. 11). Disfigured by Lakṣmaṇa for having made advances to him (III. 69. 13-18).

ARAJĀ—Daughter of Uśanā the Bhārgava, रूपेणाप्रतिमा भुवि, अनुत्तमा, कन्या (VII. 80. 4-5). Refused to comply with Daṇḍa's request (VII. 80. 1-6) and instructed him to approach her father if he wanted to have her at all (VII. 80. 7-12). Raped by Daṇḍa (VII. 80. 13-17). Waited near the hermitage for the return of her father (VII. 80. 18). In obedience to her father's wish (VII. 81. 13-15) consented to do penitentiary rites for life (VII. 81. 16).

ARIṢṬA—A hill in Laṅkā. Described (V. 56. 26-37). On his return journey, Hanumān climbed on it for leaping across the sea (V. 56. 37). The hill shook under his weight, its denizens fled and it was levelled to the ground when Hanumān took his start (V. 56. 42-50). 10 Yojanas in length and 30 in height (V. 56. 50).

ARIṢṬA-NEMI—Father of Sumati—the younger queen of Sagara (I. 38. 4). A Prajā-pati who came after

Vivasvān (III. 14. 9) मुनिः Consulted by Budha with regard to Ila (VII. 90. 5).

ARUṆA—Son of Vinatā and brother of Garuḍa (III. 14. 32). Father of Jaṭāyūs and Sampāti (III. 14. 33).

ARUNDHATĪ—Her devotion to her husband extolled by Sītā. वरिष्ठा सर्वनारीणाम् (II. 118. 11). The devoted wife of Vasiṣtha (V. 24. 10).

ARKA—A Vānara chief who defended the flank of the invading army during its march to the South (VI. 4. 33).

ARCIṢMĀN—A Vānara chief whom Sugrīva proposed to send to the west in search of Sītā (IV. 42. 3).

ARCI-MĀLYAS The—Vānara chiefs whom Sugrīva wanted to send to the west in search of Sītā महाबलाः (IV. 42. 4).

ARJUNA—(Kārtavīrya) Killed Jāmadagni—father of Paraśu-rāma (I. 75. 24). Killed by Viṣṇu (VII. 6. 35). Repaired to the Narmadā for holiday-making, when Rāvaṇa called upon him (VII. 31. 7-10). As powerful as the Fire-God, always propitiated Him with the blood of his enemies (VII. 31. 8). At a little distance from Rāvaṇa, was engaged in water-sports with his womenfolk, when in a playful mood, checked the flow of the Narmadā with his thousand arms, thus causing an overflow of the river-water that washed away the flowers offered to Śiva by Rāvaṇa (VII 32. 1-7). On hearing the report of the struggle between Rāvaṇa's courtiers and his own, and the defeat of the latter (VII. 32. 37), proceeded to set matters right after consoling his girls, fought with and disabled Prahasta and put to flight Rāvaṇa's courtiers (VII. 32. 38—48); then fighting a duel with Rāvaṇa, made him a captive and took him to his capital (VII. 32. 49-73). Received formally Pulastya and asked him what he could do to please him (VII. 33. 5-12). In

compliance with his request (VII. 33. 13-16), released Rāvaṇa honoring him with valuable gifts and contracting an alliance with him in the presence of fire (VII. 33. 17-18).

ARTHA–SĀDHAKA—A courtier of Bharata who went out to receive Rāma on his return (VI. 127. 11).

ARYAMĀ—His protection invoked by Kauśalya during Rāma's sojourn (II. 25. 8).

ALAKṢITA The—A forest in the west. Sugrīva asked Suṣena etc. to go there in search of Sītā. (IV. 42. 14.).

ALAMBUṢĀ—Wife of Ikśvāku and mother of Viśāla. (I. 47. 11-12). Her help prayed for by Bharadvāja in the matter of entertaining the army of Bharata. (II. 91. 17.). Danced in the presence of Bharata at the latter's request (II. 91. 47).

ALARKA—The Rājā who gave his eyes to a Brāhmana in fulfilment of a promise made—referred to by Kaikeyī (II. 12. 43). तेजस्वी (II. 14. 5).

AVANTĪ—(i) A town in the South. Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 10).

(ii) A town in the west. Sugrīva sent Suṣena etc. there in search of Sītā (IV. 42. 14).

AVINDHYA—A favourite counsellor of Rāvaṇa. मेधावी, विद्वान्, राक्षसपुंगवः, धृतिमान, शीलवान्, वृद्धः, (V. 37. 12). His advice to Rāvaṇa regarding Sītā's release rejected (V. 37. 13).

AṢANI-PRABHA—A Rākṣasa chief who fought a duel with Dvivida (VI. 43. 12). Killed. (VI. 43. 32-34).

AŚOKA—A messenger despatched by Vasiṣtha to bring back Bharata on the death of Daśaratha (II. 68. 5). Reached Kekaya (II. 70. 1). Well-received by the Rājā and the prince, approached Bharata, delivered Vasiṣṭha's message

and handed over the presents to him (II. 70. 2-5). Replied to Bharata's enquiries and requested him to make haste (II. 70. 11—12). Went out to receive Rāma on his return (VI. 127. 11). Ordering the citizens to be ready to receive Rāma, went out to receive him (VI. 128. 23-26).

AŚOKA PARK, The—confinement of Sītā there at the order of Rāvaṇa (III. 56. 32). सर्वकामफलैर्वृक्षैर्नाना-पुष्पफलैर्वृता, सर्वकामदैः द्विजैः समुपसेविता (III. 56. 33). Rāvaṇa's famous gardens in Laṅkā. वनिका महती महाद्रुमा (V. 13. 53). Hanumān resolved to go there in search of Sītā (V. 13. 53-56). पुण्या सर्वसंस्कारसंस्कृता (V. 13. 60). पुष्पिताग्राः विविधाः द्रुमाः (V. 14. 2). आम्रवनसम्पन्ना लताशत-समन्विता वृक्षवाटिका (V. 14. 4). विहगैः अभिनादिता, राजितैः काञ्चनैश्चैव पादपैः वृता (V. 14. 5). विहगैः मृगसंघैश्च विचित्रा चित्रकानना (V. 14. 6). पुष्पोपगफलोपगैः वृक्षैः वृता, कोकिलैः भृंगराजैः मत्तैः नित्यनिषेविता (V. 14. 7). नानाद्विजगणायुता (V. 14. 8). Abounding in tanks, lakes and rivers (V. 14. 22-26). Back-ground furnished by a lofty hill clad in trees and furnished with retiring-rooms with a river flowing down (V. 14. 27-31). Nearby there was a lake on the banks of which stood a series of palaces built by Viśva-Karman (V. 14. 32–34). दिव्यगन्धरसोपेता सर्वतः समलंकृता (V. 15. 2). हर्म्यप्रासादसंबाधा कोकिलाकुलनिःस्वना (V. 15. 3). काञ्चनोत्पल-पद्माभिर्वापीभिरुपशोभिता, बहुभूमिगुहायुता (V. 15. 4). सर्वर्तुकुसुमैः रम्यैः फलवद्भिः च पादपैः (शोभिता) (V. 15. 5). Described (V. 15. 2-15). In the heart of that garden there was a चैत्यप्रासाद that stood on a thousand pillars (V. 15. 16-18). Described (V. 18. 6-9). प्रमदावनम् (V. 18. 27). नेत्रमनःकान्ता (V. 41. 10). Destroyed by Hanumān (V. 41. 14-20).

AŚVA—name of a sage to whose hermitage the sages of Janasthāna moved, when oppressed by the Rākṣasas (II. 116. 20).

AŚVA-GRĪVA—Son of Kaśyapa and Danu (III. 14. 16).

AŚVA-PATI—uncle of Bharata. Treated him as his own son during his sojourn at Kekaya (II. 1. 2). Honoured Vasiṣṭha's messengers (II. 70. 2). Before departure Bharata took leave of him (II. 70. 14-18). Gave him costly presents (II. 70. 19-23). Bade him farewell (II 70. 28). His welfare enquired after by Kaikeyī from Bharata (II. 72. 6). परन्तपः (II. 72. 9) धर्मराजः, श्रीमान् (II. 74. 9).

AŚVINS ; THE TWO—At the request of Brahman produced two Vānara chiefs, Mainda and Dvivida (I. 17. 14). Included in the list of 33 Vedic Gods ;—sons of Kaśyapa and Aditi (III. 14. 14-15). Sallied forth to fight Rāvaṇa (VII. 27. 22). Accompanied Indra to fight with Rāvaṇa (VII. 28. 27).

AŚMA TOWN—The city in the nether world inhabited by the Kāla-keya Dānavas. Occupied by Rāvaṇa (VII. 23. 17-19).

AṢṬĀCALA—The name of a hill lying to the west on the other side of the seas. Sugrīva asked Hanumān to send for the Vānaras living there (IV. 37. 3). 10 krores came thence (IV. 37. 21). Visited by Sugrīva during his flight from Vālin's wrath (IV. 46. 19).

AṢṬĀ-VAKRA—Finally emancipated Kahola (VI. 119. 16).

ASAMAÑJA—Son of Sagara and Keśinī (I. 38. 16); (I. 70. 38). Made fun of his younger brothers by dipping them in the water of the Sarayū. पापसमाचारः, सज्जनप्रतिबाधकः Banished by the King for oppressing the people. Father of Aṁśumān (I. 38. 21-22). His banishment described in detail by Siddhārtha (II. 36. 19-30).

ASITA—Son of Bharata, whose enemies were the Kings of the Hai-hayas, Tāla-jaṅghas, and Śaśa-bindus (I.

70. 27-28). Being defeated retired to the Himālayas with two of his wives, where he died (I. 70. 29-30). At that time both of his wives were in the family way. One of them, Kālindī, gave birth to Sagara, by favour of the Ṛṣi Cyavana (I. 70. 30-37).

ASURAS, THE—Rāma requested by the Ṛṣis of the Daṇḍaka forest to kill them (I. 1. 44). Rāvaṇa excelled them in strength (I. 15. 9). Killed by the weapons produced by Dakṣa's daughters, Jayā and Suprabhā (I. 21. 13-17). Failed to bend Janaka's bow (I. 31. 9). Being hit hard by the tools of Sagara's sons, their dying wails rent the sky (I. 39. 20). Approaching Brahman complained against the conduct of Sagara's sons (I. 39. 23-26). कामरूपिनः पिशिताशनाः (III. 11. 60). विप्रघातिनः (III. 11. 63). Those dwelling in the islands used to draw their victims by means of their shadows by order of Brahman (IV. 40. 37). Aṅgada killed one in the water-less tract, south of the Vindhya (IV. 48. 17-21). Sampāti witnessed their struggle with the Devas (IV. 58. 13). Denizens of the Pātāla (V. I. 90). Defenders of a-dharma (VI. 35. 13). Went into raptures when Hanumān slapped Rāvaṇa (VI. 59. 62). Fell into raptures when being struck by Hanumān, Rāvaṇa dropped down senseless (VI. 59. 116). Wished victory to Rāvaṇa (VI. 102. 43). Ran to Brahman when Vāyu stopped blowing (VII. 35. 53). When Śatrughna took out the divine arrow to kill Lavaṇa (VII. 69. 16-19), greatly perturbed, approached Brahman (VII. 69. 20-21).

ASŪRTA-RAJAS*—Son of Kuśa and Vaidarbhī. धर्मिष्ठः सत्यवादिन् At the desire of his father founded the town of Dharmāraṇya. महामतिः (I. 32. 1-7).

---

* The Calcutta Edition reads अमूर्त-रजस् ।

AHALYĀ—Wife of Gautama, with whom she practised austerities for many years near Mithilā (I. 48. 16). Violated by Indra (I. 48. 17-19). Out of fear asked Indra to leave the cottage without delay (I. 48. 20-22). सुश्रोणी, सुमध्यमा —cursed by Gautama to pine in that hermitage for 100 years till relieved by Rāma (I. 48. 29-32). दुर्वृत्ता, दुष्टचारिणी (I. 48. 32-33). Seen by Rāma bright with the lustre of austerities, महाभागा, प्रयत्नान्निर्मिता धात्रा, दिव्या मायामयीव, like smoking fire, a fullmoon enveloped in snow, like a ray of the sun, reflected in water (I. 49. 13-15). Became visible to all on the expiation of her sin (I. 49. 16). Received Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa hospitably (I. 49. 17-18). Honored by the Devas when reconciled to Gautama (I. 49. 20). देवरूपिणी (I. 49. 11). Created as the Perfect Being by Brahman, transferred to Gautama as a trust, and then bestowed in marriage (VII. 30. 19-27). Her violation and consequent emancipation with the help of Rāma recalled by Brahman (VII. 30. 28-46).

VII.—NOTES AND QUERIES

By Gopinath Kaviraj

(i).—Virgin Worship.

The Mahākālasaṃhitā says that the best way of propitiating Śiva is to worship a virgin (कुमारी) and to feed her. The Kaulas are to worship her in the night and the Smārtas in afternoon. The virgin should be well bathed, well draped in a piece of multi-coloured cloth and well decorated. She must be one whose heart has not yet been even touched with passion and who has not fallen into love. She must be of 7, 8 or 9 years of age, of fair complexion, of noble birth, and with her parents living. She must not be deformed in body, long-haired, with protruding teeth, or betrothed to any body (वाग्दत्ता).

In the Yāmala a virgin is said to be of 3 kinds, viz. parā, aparā and parāparā. The Virgin was the Sole Existence before the Creation of the Universe and is therefore known by the name of आद्याशक्ति or Primal Energy (आद्या).

Names of the virgin from the 1st to the 16th year are as given below—Sandhyā, Sarasvatī, Tridhāmūrti, Kālikā, Subhagā, Umā, Mālinī, Kūbjikā, Kāla Saṃgharshā, Aparājitā, Rudrāṇī, Bhairavī, Mahālakṣmī, Kulanāyikā, Kṣetrajñā and Chaṇḍikā.

As for the mode of her worship the Mahākālasaṃhitā says that the virgin is to be conducted respectfully with music and entertainments to the door of the hall of worship. The number of virgins to be worshipped must be an odd number, either 5 or 7 or 9 or even 11. Of these the fairest one is to be considered as the Primary (मुख्या) One, but if many maidens

are not available one will do. In Kāmya and Naimittika pūjās only one is needed, while in the autumnal worship a large number is a necessity. They are to be kept standing in a row, with their eyes cast down. The worshipper is to regard the मुख्या as identical with the Goddess herself, take up a cup of wine, and go through the process of prāṇāyāma, bhūtāpasāraṇa (expulsion of evil spirits), obeisance to Guru and Gaṇeśa, and Digbandhana. He is then to wash her feet, place the water on his head and rub her feet with the corner of his own wearing garment. With unbroken rice (अक्षत) he should then perform the ceremony for removing the obstacles(विघ्नोत्सारण). The ceremonies for expelling the evil influences (भूतापसारण and विघ्नोत्सारण) have to be performed once again, the reason being that many minor gods and goddesses enter the hall of worship together with the Virgin Goddess to see her; and very often they create disturbances. The worshipper has to take with his left hand the right hand of the maiden, step forth with his right foot planted first on the ground and lead the line of the maidens on into the hall, uttering 5 verses in her praise: त्वमम्ब जगतामाद्ये जगदाधाररूपिणि &c.

The worship of the मुख्या is enough to please the rest. This is followed by an act of offering to the minor gods. Then follows Kumārīnyāsa. The names of the 18 maidens and their respective seats in the body : Mahāchandra Yogeśvarī, Siddhikarālī, Siddhivikarālī, Mahāntā marī (??), Vajrakapālinī, Muṇḍamālinī, Aṭṭahāsinī, Chaṇḍakapālinī, Kālachakreśvarī, Guhyakālī, Kātyāyanī, Kāmākhyā, Chāmuṇḍā, Siddhilakṣmī, Kubjikā, Mātaṅgī, Chaṇḍeśvarī and Kaumārī. Their respective seats: head (शिर:), face (मुख), eyes, ears, nostrils, cheeks, lines of teeth, shoulders, heart, arms, belly (जठर), back, thighs, knees, hips (जङ्घा), legs and the entire frame.

The worships of 9 goddesses-viz. Śuddhā, Kālıkā, Lalitā, Mālinī, Vasundharā, Sarasvatī, Ramā, Gaurī and Durgā-and of two gods viz. Baṭuka, a boy of 5 years, and Gaṇeśa, of 9 years,-are enjoined. So also of 8 Bhairavas-viz. Asitāṅga Bhairava, Ruru°, Chaṇḍa°, Krodha°, Unmatta°, Kapāli°, Bhīṣaṇa° and Saṃhāra°-and of 8 Devīs-viz Mahāmāyā, Kālarātrī, Sarvamaṅgalā, Damarukā, Rājarājeśvarī, Sampatpradā, Bhagavatī and Kumārī. The 6 Śaktis attendant on the Devīs are named: Anaṅga Kusumā, °Manmathā, °Madanā, °Kusumāturā, °Madanāturā and °Śiśirā.

The worship of the मुख्या being over, the remaining maidens should next be attended to. They should be allowed to eat of the food offered up to them in silence. No sound of any instrument should be made to disturb them at their meals. The worshipper with folded hands should sing in their praise a hymn called कुमारीस्तोत्र (16 verses in anuṣṭup metre, from the Mahākāla Saṃhitā). After they have taken their food they should be served with betels in due form. This is followed by the offering of dakṣiṇā, and finally the ceremony of Visarjana.

The leavings of their dishes should be given to jackals or buried in the earth.

The worship of the Virgin is recommended during the Navarātra festival for 9 days in succession. The names of the 9 Durgās to be worshipped on the 9 days are: Hṛllekhā, Gaganā, Raktā, Mahochchhuṣmā, Karālikā, Ichchhā, Jñāna, Kriyā and Durgā. Last of all we find the following remarkable expression:—

यदि सा क्षोभमायाति स्वयमेव विलासिनी ।
तया सह नयेद्दु रात्रिं वासरं वा निशीतधीः ॥
कुमारीं न स्पृशेदेव भावयुक्तेन चेतसा ।
अन्यथा मृत्युमायाति नो चेद्दु देवी पराङ्मुखी ॥

THE PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA TEXTS.

Edited by

GOPINATH KAVIRAJ, M. A.

No. 1—The Kiraṇāvalî Bhāskara, a Commentary on Udayana's Kiraṇāvalî, Dravya section, by Padmanābha Miśra. Edited with Introduction and Index by Gopînātha Kavirāj, M. A.

No 2—The Advaita Chintāmaṇi by Rangoji Bhaṭṭa, Ed. with Introduction etc. by Nārāyaṇa Śāstrî Khiste Sāhityāchārya.

No. 3—The Vedānta Kalpalatikā, by Madhusūdana Sarasvatî. Ed. with Introduction etc. by Rāmājñā Pāṇḍeya Vyākaraṇāchārya.

No. 4—The Kusumāñjali Bodhanî, a Commentary on Udayana's Theistic Tract, NyāyaKusumāñjali, by Varadaraja. Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopināth Kavirāj, M.A.

No. 5—The Rasasāra, a Commentary on Udayana's Kiraṇāvalî, Guṇa Section, by Bhaṭṭa Vādîndra. Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopînāth Kavirāj, M.A.

No. 6. (Part I)—The Bhāvanā Viveka by Maṇḍana Miśra, with a Commentary by Bhaṭṭa Umbeka. Ed. with Introduction etc. by M. M. Gangānātha Jhā, M.A., D. Litt.

No. 6 (Part II)—Ditto Ditto

No. 7 (Part I)—Yoginîhṛdaya dîpikā, by Amṛtānanda Nātha, being a Commentary on Yoginîhṛdaya, a part of Vāmakeśvara Tantra. Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopînāth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 7—(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No 8—The Kāvyaḍākinî, by Gaṅgānanda Kavîndra. Ed. with Introduction etc. by Jagannātha Śāstri Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya.

No. 9 (Part I)—The Bhakti Chandrikā, a Commentary on Śāṇḍilya's Bhaktisūtras, by Nārāyaṇa Tîrtha. Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopînāth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 10(Part I)–The Siddhāntaratna by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopînāth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 10–(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No. 11–The Śri Vidyā Ratna Sūtras, by Gauḍapāda, with a Commentary by Śaṅkarāraṇya.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Nārāyaṇa Śāstri Khiste Sāhityāchārya.

No. 12–The Rasapradîpa, by Prabhākara Bhaṭṭa.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Nārāyaṇa Śastri Khiste Sāhityāchārya.

No. 13–The Siddhasiddānta Sangraha, by Balabhadra.
Ed. with Introduction by Gopinath Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 14–The Triveṇikā, by Âśadhara Bhaṭṭa.
Ed. with Introduction by Baṭukanath Śarmā Sāhityopādhyāya, M. A. and Jagannātha Śāstrî Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya.

No. 15–(Part I)–The Tripurārahasya.
Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopinātḥ Kavirāj, M.A.

No 15–(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No. 16–The Kāvya Vilāsa, by Chirañjiva Bhaṭṭāchārya.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Baṭukanātha Śarma Sāhityopādhyāya, M. A. and Jagannātha Śāstrî Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya.

No. 17–The Nyāya Kalikā, by Bhaṭṭa Jayanta.
Ed with Introduction by M. M. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, M. A., D. Litt.

No. 18 (Part I)–The Gorakṣa Siddhānta Saṅgraha.
Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopînāth Kavirāj, M.A.

No. 19 (Part I)—The Prākṛta Prakāśa by Vararuchi with the Prākṛta Sañjīvanī by Vasantarāja and the Subodhini by Sadānanda.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Batuk Nath Śarma, M.A. and Baladeva Upādhyāya, M.A.

No. 19 (Part II)—

No. 20—The Mansatattvaviveka by Viśvanatha Nyâyapañchānana Ed. with Introduction by Jagannātha Sastri Hoshing.

No. 21–(Part I) The Nyāya Siddhānta Mālā, by Jayarāma Nyāyapañchānana Bhaṭṭâchârya.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Mangala Deva Sastri, M. A., D. Phil.

No. 22–The Dharmânubandhi Śloka Chaturdaśî, by Śri Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, with a Com. by Râma Pandit.
Ed. with Introduction. etc. by Nârâyaṇa Śâstrī Khiste Sâhityâchârya.

No. 23–Navaratna pradîpa, by Nanda Pandit Dharmâdhikârî.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Vaijanâtha Sastri Varakale Dharmasastra Sastri.

No. 24–Śrî Râma tâpinîyopaniṣad with the Com. called Râma Kâśikâ in Pūrvatâpini and Ânandanidhi in Uttaratâpinī by Ânanda Vana.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Anantarâma Śâstrī Vetāla Sāhityopâdhyâya.

No. 25–Sâpiṇḍya Kalpalatikâ by Sadâśiva Deva *alias* Âpadeva with the Com. of Nârâyaṇa Deva.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Jagannâtha Śâstri Hoshinga Sāhityopâdhyâya.

THE PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES.

Edited by

GOPINATH KAVIRAJ, M.A.

Vol. I—

(a) Studies in Hindu Law (I): its evolution, by Gaṅgā nātha Jhā.

(b) The View point of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Philosophy, by Gopinath Kaviraj.

(c) Nirmāṇa Kāya, by Gopināth Kavirāj.

Vol. II—

(a) Paraśurāma Miśra ALIAS Vāṇî Rasāla Rāya, by Gopināth Kavirāj.

(b) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya, by the late Col. G.A. Jacob.

(c) Studies in Hindu Law (2):—its sources, by Gaṅgā nath Jhā.

(d) A new Bhakti Sūtra, by Gopināth Kaviraj.

(e) The System of Chakras according to Gorakṣanātha, by Gopināth Kavirāj.

(f) Theism in Ancient India, by Gopināth Kavirāj.

(g) Hindu Poetics, by Baṭuka Nātha Śarmā.

(h) A seventeenth Century Astrolabe, by Padmākara Dvivedi.

(i) Some aspects of Vîra Śaiva Philosophy, by Gopināth Kaviraj.

(j) Nyāya Kusumāñjali (English Translation), by Gopi Nāth Kavirāj.

(k) The Definition of Poetry, by Nārāyaṇa Śāstrî Khiste.

(l) Sondala Upādhyāya, by Gopināth Kaviraj.

Vol. III—

(a) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya by the late Col. G.A. Jacob.

(b) Studies in Hindu Law (3): Judicial Procedure; by Gaṅgānāth Jha.

(c) Theism in Ancient India, by Gopināth Kavirāj.

(d) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopinath Kavirāj.

(e) Naiṣadha and Śri Harṣa by Nîlakamala Bhaṭṭāchārya,

(f) Indian Dramaturgy, by P.N. Pāṭaṇakar.

Vol. IV—

(a) Studies in Hindu Law (4): Judicial Procedure: by Gaṅganātha Jhā.

(b) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopināth Kaviraj.
(c) Analysis of the Contents of the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, by Maṅgala Deva Śāstri.
(d) Nārāyaṇa's Gaṇita Kaumudi, by Padmākara Dvivedi.
(e) Food and Drink in the Rāmāyanic Age, by Manmatha Nāth Ray.
(f) Satkāryavāda: Causality in Sāṅkhya, by Gopinath Kaviraj
(g) Discipline by Consequences, by G.L Sinha.
(h) History of the origin and expansion of the Aryans, by A. C. Ganguly.
(i) Punishments in Ancient Indian Schools by G. L. Sinha

Vol. V—
(a) Ancient Home of the Aryans and their migration to India, by Atul Chandra Ganguly.
(b) A Satrap Coin, by Shyam Lal Mehr.
(c) An Estimate of the civilisation of the Vānaras as depicted in the Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray.
(d) A Comparison of the contents of the Ṛgveda, Vājasaneyi, Taittirîya—, and Atharvaveda-(Cāturadhyāyikā) Prātiśākhyas, by Mangal Deva Shastri.
(e) Doctrine of Formal Training and the Ancient Indian Thought, by G. L. Sinha.
(f) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopi Nath Kaviraj.
(g) An Index to the proper names occurring in Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray.
(h) Notes and Queries, by Gopinath Kaviraj.

Vol. VI—(In progress)
(a) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya, by the late Col. G.A. Jacob.
(b) Some aspects of the History and Doctrines of the Nāthas, by Gopinath Kaviraj.
(c) An Index to the proper names occurring in Vālmîkî's Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray.
(d) Studies in Hindu Law (5): Evidence, by Gaṅgānātha Jhā.

To be had of—
(1) The Superintendent, Govt. Press, Allahabad.
(2) Messrs. Braj Bhushan Das & Co., Thateri Bazar, Benares City.
(3) Babu Jaya Krishna Das Gupta, Chowkhamba Book Depot, Benares City.